

Concordia Theological Monthly

Vol. XVII

FEBRUARY, 1946

No. 2

How Dr. Martin Luther Died

By THEO. HOYER

Since 1883 Lutherans, and generally all Protestants, have observed the 400th anniversary of the chief events in the life of the great Reformer: Luther's birth; the posting of the Ninety-five Theses; the Diet of Worms; the publication of Luther's two Catechisms; the Diet of Augsburg; the preparation of the Smalcald Articles. This year we reach the end; the 18th of February marks the 400th return of the day of Luther's death. Judging by past experience, notice of this anniversary will be taken in most church periodicals. Not all of it will be friendly; old legends will be warmed up, old suspicions and insinuations repeated. It is well that we recall to memory what is known of Luther's last days.

In preparation for the 400th anniversary of the Reformation (1917) Dr. W. H. T. Dau published a little brochure under the title *Luther Examined and Re-examined*. It is not as widely known as it deserves to be. We reprint one of the last chapters in the book.

LUTHER ANNOUNCES HIS DEATH

Mark Twain awoke one morning to find himself reported dead. He did not accept the invitation suggested in the report, but wired to his friends: "Reports of my death grossly exaggerated." Luther was placed in a similar predicament by Catholics, who were deeply interested in the question how long he was to continue to live. One day in the early part of March, 1545, he was handed a printed letter in Italian which contained the news of his demise under curious circumstances.

He thought that he ought not to withhold this interesting information from the world: he had a German translation made of the document, which he published with his remarks as follows:

"Copy of a Letter of the Ambassador of the Most Christian King Regarding a Horrible Sign Which Occurred in the Shameful Death of Martin Luther.

"A horrible and unheard-of miracle which the blessed God has wrought in the shameful death of Martin Luther, who went to hell, soul and body, as may be clearly seen from a chapter of the letter of the ambassador of the Most Christian King, to the praise and glory of Jesus Christ and the confirmation and comfort of the faithful.

"COPY OF THE LETTER

"1. Martin Luther, having been taken ill, desired the holy Sacrament of the body of our Lord Jesus Christ. He died immediately upon receiving it. When he saw that his sickness was very violent and he was near death, he prayed that his body might be placed on an altar and worshiped as God. But the goodness and providence of God had resolved to put an end to his great error and to silence him forever. Accordingly, God did not omit to work this great miracle, which was very much needed, to cause the people to desist from the great, destructive, and ruinous error which the said Luther has caused in the world. As soon as his body had been placed in the grave, an awful rumbling and noise was heard, as if hell and the devils were collapsing. All present were seized with a great fright, terror, and fear, and when they raised their eyes to heaven, they plainly saw the most holy host of our Lord Jesus Christ which this unworthy man was permitted to receive unworthily. I affirm that all who were present saw the most holy host visibly floating in the air. They took the most holy host very devoutly and with great reverence and gave it a decent place in the sanctuary.

"2. When this had been done, no such tumult and hellish rumbling was heard any more that day. However, during the following night, at the place where Martin Luther's corpse had been buried, there was heard by everybody in the community a much greater confusion than the first time. The people arose and flocked together in great fear and terror.

At daybreak they went to open the grave where the wicked body of Luther had been placed. When the grave was opened, you could clearly see that there was no body, neither flesh nor bone, nor any clothes. But such a sulphuric stench rose from the grave that all who were standing around the grave turned sick. On account of this miracle many have reformed their lives by returning to the holy Christian faith, to the honor, praise, and glory of Jesus Christ, and to the strengthening and confirmation of His holy Christian Church, which is a pillar of truth."

Luther appended the following comment to this pious document:

"And I, Martinus Luther, D., do by these indentures acknowledge and testify that I have received this angry fiction concerning my death on the twenty-first day of March, and that I have read it with considerable pleasure and joy, except the blasphemous portion of the document in which this lie is attributed to the exalted majesty of God. Otherwise I felt quite tickled on my knee-cap and under my left heel at this evidence how cordially the devil and his minions, the Pope and the papists, hate me. May God turn them from the devil!

"However, if it is decreed that theirs is a sin unto death and that my prayer is in vain, then may God grant that they fill up their measure and write nothing else but such books for their comfort and joy. Let them run their course; they are on the right track; they want to have it so. Meanwhile I want to know how they are going to be saved and how they will atone for, and revoke, all their lies and blasphemies with which they have filled the world." (XXI b, 3376 f.)

Similar even more grotesque tales have been served the faithful by Catholic writers. The star production of this kind was published years ago in the *Ohio-Waisenfreund*. It related that horrible and uncanny signs had accompanied Luther's death. Weird shrieks and noises were heard; devils were flying about in the air; the heavens were shrouded in a pall of gloom. When the funeral cortege started from Eisleben, a vast flock of ravens had gathered and accompanied the corpse, croaking incessantly and uttering dismal cries all the way to Wittenberg, etc., etc.

These crude stories have now been censored out of existence. Catholics nowadays prefer to lie in a more refined

and cultured manner about Luther's death: Luther committed suicide; he was found hanging from his bedpost one morning.

Comment is unnecessary.

Luther died peacefully in the presence of friends, confessing Christ and asserting with his last breath his firm allegiance to the faith he had proclaimed. The probable cause of his death was a stroke of paralysis. Luther began to feel pains in the chest late in the afternoon of February 17, 1546. He bore up manfully and continued working at his business for the Count of Mansfeld who had called him to Eisleben. After a light evening meal he sat chatting in a cheerful mood with his companions, and retired early, as was his custom in his declining years. The pains in the chest became worse, and he began to feel chilly. Medicaments were administered, and after a while he fell into a slumber, which lasted an hour. He awoke with increased pain and a feeling of great congestion, which caused the death perspiration to break out. He was rapidly turning cold. All this time he was praying and reciting portions from the Psalms and other texts. Three times in succession he repeated his favorite text, John 3:16. Gradually he became peaceful, and his end was so gentle that the bystanders were in doubt whether he had expired or was only in a swoon. They worked with him, trying to rouse him, until they were convinced that he had breathed his last. The Catholic apothecary John Landau, who had been called in while Luther was thought to be in a swoon, helped to establish the fact of his death.

So far Dr. Dau's chapter. We add some explanations and later findings.

Forty-three years after Luther's death the Italian Oratorian Thomas Bozius published the first account of Luther's "suicide." Fifteen years later the Franciscan Sedulius, the same man whose brain hatched the fantastic brood of ravens resurrected in the *Ohio-Waisenfreund*, repeated the story, which an anonymous servant of Luther had allegedly told to an anonymous "pious man," who told it to an unknown "trustworthy man," from whom (through how many additional mouths deponent sayeth not) it came to Sedulius. The tale was taken up by the Jesuit Gottlieb¹ in 1883, who, however,

¹ Gottlieb, *Hamburger Briefe*, Berlin, 1883.

stated that he personally did not credit the story. Not so P. Majunke,² former editor of the Roman Catholic *Germania*, then priest in Hochkirch at Gross-Glogau. He claimed to have found a new document attesting the fact of Luther's suicide; it was, however, nothing but that tale told by Bozius together with hair-raising accounts of the death of Oecolampadius, Bucer, Calvin, and Zwingli.³

The circumstances surrounding Luther's death were again investigated by D. Th. Kolde, Professor of Historic Theology in Erlangen, Prof. D. Wilhelm Walther of Rostock, and others.

These are the results. Sixteen persons were eyewitnesses of Luther's death: Michael Coelius; Justus Jonas; two of Luther's sons, Paul and Martin; his Wittenberg servant Ambrosius; his host in Eisleben, the secretary of the city, Hans Albrecht; two doctors of Eisleben, Doctor Ludwig and Magister Simon Wilde; Count Albrecht of Mansfeld; Count Henry of Schwarzburg and his wife; Johann Aurifaber; three more Counts of Mansfeld: Philip, Hans Georg, and Vollrath; and Prince Wolf of Anhalt. Within a few hours five of them wrote letters with an account of Luther's departure which are extant: Justus Jonas (to the Elector of Saxony), Albrecht of Mansfeld, Wolf of Anhalt (also to John Frederick of Saxony), Johann Aurifaber (to Michael Gutt in Halle), and Hans Georg of Mansfeld (to Duke Maurice of Saxony). Then Jonas, Coelius, and Aurifaber wrote a detailed *Historia* of Luther's death, with this concluding sentence: "Wir . . . zeugen dies vor Gott und auf unsere eigene letzte Hinfahrt und Gewissen, dass wir dieses nicht anders gehoert und gesehen . . . und dass wir es nicht anders erzaehlen, denn wie es allenthalben ergangen und geschehen." All of these accounts agree; the brief statement of Dr. Dau above is fact.⁴

Over and above this we have the report of a Catholic eyewitness, a *Mansfelder Buerger*, published by Luther's bitter enemy Joh. Cochlaeus, separately at first, then as part of his biography of Luther. The Catholic N. Paulus has convincingly demonstrated that this *Mansfelder Buerger* was none

² *Luthers Lebensende*. Eine historische Untersuchung von Paul Majunke, Mainz, 1890.

³ The accounts of Bozius and of Sedulius quoted by Kolde, *Luthers Selbstmord*, p. 26 f. and p. 41 f.

⁴ Kolde, *Luthers Selbstmord*, p. 11 ff. — W. Walther, *Fuer Luther wider Rom*, p. 193.

other than the Catholic apothecary in Eisleben, Johann Landau, who was called in to revive Luther.⁵ This is his report: "Feria quarta in coena rursus valde laetus fuit et faceciis fabulisque recitandis dicax omnibus mouens risum. Ad circiter horam Octavam conquestus est, se aliquantulum male habere sicut Epistola (the letter of Jonas) de eo scripta refert. Post medium noctis repente vocati sunt ad eum duo Medici, quorum alter Doctor alter Magister erat: Qui ubi advenerunt non repperunt in eo ullum amplius pulsum. Scripserunt tamen mox receptum quoddam pro emittendo Clisterio seu Enemate" etc. (The procedure is then described, and he continues:) "Quandoquidem et antea aliquoties pro mortuo habitus fuerat, sine motu et sensu vitae aliquandiu iacens id quod Smalcaldiae quoque eidem acciderat, quando calculo excruciatu esset. . . . Idcirco iussus est Apothecarius odorifera aqua illa ungere ac fricare corpus mortui. Qui sane sedulo ac impigre iussa peragens applicuit aquam illam multis frictionibus aliquandiu naribus, ori, fronti, pulsui ac mammae sinistrae."⁶

In Majunke's reference to that premature announcement of Luther's death we catch a glimpse of history writing as it should not be. He asserts that Luther himself manufactured and spread that story, so that later it could be said: "That's nothing new; a year before his death that tall tale was told" — as though Luther expected the devil to get him and prepared for that emergency. The Reformer, Majunke says, often acted on the principle: The end justifies the means; his conviction was "ad papatum decipiendum omnia licere." He gave no reference for this citation; but the phrase already had a history; Joh. Janssen had cited it (*Deutsche Geschichte*, II:107) and translated: "Wir halten dafuer, dass uns zur Hintergehung und zum Verderben desselben (des Papsttums) um des Heiles der Seelen willen alles erlaubt ist." No reference; but Walther (*Luther im neuesten roemischen Gericht*, Heft II, p. 2) charged him with giving a wrong translation of Luther's words. Answering his friend Joh. Lang, who had objected to Luther's strong language in his *Letter to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation*, Luther admitted having written sharply,

⁵ N. Paulus, *Luthers Lebensende*, p. 67 ff.

⁶ Cited from Cochleus de actis et scriptis Lutheri, in Kolde, *Luthers Selbstmord*, p. 18.

but continued: "Nos hic persuasi sumus papatum esse veri et germani illius Antichristi sedem, in cuius deceptionem et nequitiam ob salutem animarum nobis omnia licere arbitramur."⁷ Janssen in later editions changed his translation; but Majunke promptly changed the original to justify his rendering; he cited Luther as saying: "*ad cuius deceptionem*," etc. In the second edition he silently omitted this; neither he nor Janssen ever confessed the error in the first edition; and this had gone out, to be quoted to this day. Against the charge that Luther himself had written and spread the false report of his death it was pointed out that it was originally written in Italian; moreover there is extant the letter of Philip of Hesse to Luther telling how the document came to him; Philip's letter to the Elector in which he asks that the Italian document be sent to Luther and encloses the letter of the man in Augsburg who had sent it to Philip, stating that the document had been printed in Naples. And Majunke must have known all this; for he quoted a note of Seckendorf's *Commentarius historicus* in which occurs a reference to that premature report and those who even then spread the rumor that Luther had written it; and on the same page Seckendorf names the letters which tell how Luther received it.

The facts of Luther's death are as well attested as any event in history, and Catholic historians who value their reputation acknowledge it. Grisar⁸ gives a correct and detailed account, which is based, he states, on letters of eyewitnesses, the report of Landau, and the *Historia* of Jonas, Coelius, and Aurifaber; and though he thinks that the *Historia* contains "palpable exaggerations concerning the pious aphorisms and prayers of Luther," he adds: "There is, however, no adequate warrant for impugning the substantial credibility of this and other accounts, as has been done in recent times. . . . The fable of Luther's alleged suicide, which some writers (notably P. Majunke) have exploited in recent years, is based on an apocryphal letter, attributed to an alleged servant of Luther, whose name is not mentioned. . . . The fable belongs to a

⁷ De Wette, *Luthers Briefe*, I, 478. Enders, *Luthers Briefwechsel*, II, 461.

⁸ *Martin Luther, His Life and Work*. By Hartmann Grisar, S. J. St. Louis, 1935, pp. 575, 576, 578.—The book carries the *Nihil Obstat* of Joannes Rothensteiner, Censor Librorum, and the Imprimatur of Archbishop Glennon.

category of inventions, quite common at the time, devised for the purpose of imputing a disgraceful death to an opponent, especially if he happened to be an ecclesiastic. Many prominent men were made to die in despair and impenitence, or to terminate their lives by suicide." And at the end of a long list of such fables he concludes: "These tales merely prove how greatly the Catholics had been horrified at Luther's conduct"; which is obviously an admission that Catholics invented them. Joseph Clayton⁹ closes the account: "Jonas of Wittenberg and another friend, Coelius, the court preacher to the Count of Mansfeld, were with him when the stroke came and, pressing the dying man for an answer to their question whether he died faithful to the doctrine of Christ which he preached, received a whispered 'Yes' for the reply they sought. So died Martin Luther, and many fantastic legends sprang up concerning his death as friend or foe sought to glorify or defame this extraordinary man. Not so died the movement which he, and he alone, had created."

The *Historia* records Luther's last prayer (Walch, *Luthers Werke*, Vol. XXI, Nachlese, p. 287): "O mein himmlischer Vater, ein Gott und Vater unsers Herrn Jesu Christi, du Gott alles Trostes! Ich danke dir, dass du mir deinen lieben Sohn Jesum Christum geoffenbart hast, an den ich glaube, den ich gepredigt und bekannt habe, den ich geliebet und gelobet habe, welchen der leidige Papst und alle Gottlosen schaenden, verfolgen und laestern. Ich bitte dich, mein Herr Jesu Christe, lass dir mein Seelichen befohlen sein. O himmlischer Vater, ob ich schon diesen Leib lassen und aus diesem Leben hinweggerissen werden muss, so weiss ich doch gewiss, dass ich bei dir ewig bleiben und aus deinen Haenden mich niemand reissen kann."

St. Louis, Mo.

⁹ *Luther and His Work*. Milwaukee, 1937, p. 189. Published as a number of the "Science and Culture Series," of which Joseph Husslein, S. J., of St. Louis University, is general editor. Nihil Obstat: H. B. Ries, Censor Librorum. Imprimatur: Samuel A. Stritch, Archbishop of Milwaukee.



Dispensationalism Examined and Found Wanting*

Premillennialism is currently very popular with the Fundamentalists. The doctrinal statements of all Fundamentalist associations profess belief in the premillennial coming of Christ and of His visible rule on earth during the millennium. Likewise, the Holiness and Pentecostal bodies teach the premillennial coming of Christ. "Christ, the coming king," is one of the four main points of the Foursquare Gospel.

The most radical type of premillennialism is dispensationalism. Dispensationalism was first advocated by J. M. Darby of the Plymouth Brethren about a century ago. The Plymouth Brethren have remained a small sect, but their theory of dispensationalism has been popularized by James H. Brookes of St. Louis (Maranatha, 1870); the Prophetic Conferences since 1878; the Scofield Reference Bible (printed in two million copies, revised edition of 1917), and by W. E. Blackstone's "Jesus Is Coming" (sent gratis to practically all Protestant pastors some thirty-five years ago). Modern dispensationalism is based on the theory that all time is divided into cycles of seven, among them the creation week and Israel's religious calendar (the Sabbath at the end of seven days, Pentecost seven weeks after the Passover, the Feast of Tabernacles seven months after the Passover, the Sabbatical Year at the end of seven years, and the Year of Jubilee at the end of seven times seven years). The latter proves, so argue the dispensationalists, that the history of mankind must also be divided into seven aeons, or dispensations, and that, corresponding to the creation week, God appointed six dispensations of labor to be followed by one of rest (the millennium). Scofield defines a dispensation as "a period of time during which man is tested in respect to obedience to some specific revelation of the will of God." On the basis of 2 Pet. 3:8 some divide the history of the world into seven eras of exactly 1,000 years (sun years), while most dispensationalists make the following division: the dispensation of innocence, ending with the Fall; of conscience, terminated

* A new publication on this subject is *Prophecy and the Church* by Oswald T. Allis, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., Philadelphia, 339 pp., 8¼x5¼. \$2.50.

by the Flood; of human government, ending with the destruction of Sodom; of patriarchal promise, lasting until the destruction of Pharaoh; of the Sinaitic Law, which ended at the crucifixion; of the Gospel, to be ended by Christ's first judgment and to be followed by the dispensation of rest, ushered in by the glorious manifestation of Christ as king of this world and finished by the second Judgment.

Dispensationalism goes beyond premillennialism on another point. The premillennialists view the millennium chiefly as a Christian era in which the resurrected and transfigured saints will rule with Christ. Dispensationalism, however, believes that the millennium is exclusively Judaistic. The dispensationalist holds that the "mystery" of the Church was entirely unknown to the Old Testament and revealed first to the Apostle Paul; that the Church is only a "parenthesis" between the Old Testament kingdom and the renewed and restored kingdom of the millennium, a sort of interruption in the fulfillment of God's promises to Israel. The dispensationalists are united in the view that God's purposes as revealed in the Bible are twofold: one is related to the earth, with earthly people and earthly objectives, namely, the history and ultimate glorification of the Jewish race; the other purpose is related to heaven, with heavenly people and heavenly objectives, namely, the Christian Church of the sixth, or New Testament, dispensation. (L. S. Chafer, of Dallas Theological Seminary, in "Dispensationalism," p. 448.) The theory, then, is that the Old Testament promises concerning the establishment of the Davidic throne were temporarily halted, but that ultimately all the Old Testament prophecies, especially those of the Psalms, dealing with Israel, must be carried out to the letter. Much is made of the argument that the promise to Abraham that he would possess the Land of Canaan was an unconditional promise, not contingent upon man's obedience or disobedience, and that all unconditional promises must be literally fulfilled. Another prominent view is, that the Church will be "raptured," that is, taken out of this world when Jesus will fulfill the promises made in His covenant with Israel.

Dr. Oswald T. Allis, professor of Old Testament at Princeton Seminary and later at Westminster Seminary, in the publication referred to, *Prophecy and the Church*, exam-

ines dispensationalism primarily as it is presented in the writings of Darby and in the Scofield Bible. In ten chapters, he thoroughly refutes the principles of dispensationalism, shows the hopeless confusion and the ridiculous deductions of dispensational Bible interpretation. The purpose is to show that the Old Testament prophecies are not to a physical Israel, but are spiritual and refer to the Church. Prof. Allis submits the results of his ripe scholarship in the field of the Old Testament and of his wide reading in dispensational literature. This is by far the most comprehensive study on dispensationalism.

In order that our readers who have to deal with dispensationalism may gain an overview of the chief arguments against dispensationalism, we have taken the liberty of submitting a digest of Dr. Allis' book under four headings:

1. *Theory of Interpretation.* The dispensationalists, being Fundamentalists, accept the Bible as the inerrant Word of God. However, they are literalistic. This seems reverent, because it demands acceptance of every word just as it reads. This method leaves no room for the spiritual meaning which God obviously used in the Old Testament prophecies, nor for the fact that the Old Testament is preparatory for the New. The dispensationalists say that the word "Israel" can only mean a physical Israel. Commenting on Is. 9:7, Scofield says that David's throne is as definitely a historical throne as the throne of the Caesars (pp. 16-25). Such literalism involves the dispensationalists in inconsistencies, hairsplitting, and arbitrary interpretations. The "lost week of Daniel" offers considerable difficulty to the premillennialists. The dispensationalists, however, say that this prophecy is clear when one keeps in mind that God has a "Jewish time," that is, only that time in prophecy is to be reckoned when Israel is directly under God's rule, while those periods of history when Israel is not a nation are reckoned as "time out," similarly as the time of a football game is determined by a stop watch (118). In their literalism they hold that leaven is always the principle of corruption and that therefore the Christian Church, built by Christ Himself, is doomed to destruction (87 f.).

2. *The Wrong Philosophy of History.* Christians believe that the Church is the center of the history of the world. Dispensationalism, however, holds that the purpose of history

is twofold: a) To bring about the restoration of Israel under a king of David's line (Jesus) and the elevation of the Jews to the pre-eminent position among the nations; and b) to fulfill the promises to the Church during the present Gospel age, especially that the "mystery" of the Church is to be revealed (98). While St. Paul in Eph. 3 says that the mystery which he was called upon to preach is the glorious truth that Jew and Gentile have become members of Christ's body, the dispensationalists say that the Church itself is the mystery, a *parenthesis* between the Old Testament and the millennial kingdom of Israel. This mystery Church, which "interrupted" temporarily the Messiah's kingdom, will be done away with or "raptured" (90 f.). Dr. Allis shows the inevitable conflicts in which dispensationalists become involved with this theory that the Church is only a parenthesis between the Old Testament and the millennium. It brings the Apostles Peter and Paul into sharp conflict. The dispensationalists distinguish between the professing Church of Peter and the mystery Church of Paul: the former, the "Satanic counterfeit," to be spewed out; the other, the mystery Church, to be "raptured," removed from this world, and to reign with Christ in heaven (102). The Church is thus given a position of secondary importance in the history of this world, and it must make room for Judaism, which will be restored to its world-wide importance (251). Since Paul's mission was to reveal the "mystery," or "parenthesis," Church, he had no business to go to Jerusalem (Acts 21:4), and he was subsequently punished for going and failing to observe the distinction between the "professing" and the "mystery" Church (104 ff.).

3. *Denial of the Means of Grace.* During the "mystery period" the commission to preach the Gospel was given to the Church. The Church, however, has not been very successful in carrying out its commission, in fact, is virtually bankrupt (236 f.). The Jewish people, however, will become the ambassadors of the Lord (352 f.). Scofield goes so far in the denial of the efficacy of the means of grace as to say that we are now living in the end of the times of the Gentiles and that there is no hope for humanity except in the *personal* return of the Lord in glory (253). In the millennium the Kingdom of God will be established by power (232). This is

the Calvinistic doctrine of irresistible grace. The Calvinistic idea of the sovereignty of God also becomes evident when dispensationalists claim that in the millennium all men will recognize the supremacy of the Davidic kingdom and will submit themselves to its rule. But the sovereignty of God is not sovereign after all, for Scofield and others say that the word *submit* means only "to pretend," "to make a show of obedience." In other words, there will be many under Christ's visible rule who will submit themselves to a rule which they actually hate (241). Strange theology indeed!

4. *Dispensationalism Disparages the Gospel.* While dispensationalists preach the fundamental doctrines, particularly the vicarious atonement, nevertheless they rob the Church of the comfort of the many promises of the Bible. The Old Testament, especially the Psalms, and the Gospel of Matthew are, according to dispensationalism, not intended for the New Testament Church, but for the kingdom of Israel, whose establishment is temporarily postponed. Dispensationalism, however, also robs Israel by taking from it all the Messianic prophecies (277). Dispensationalism claims that during the Church era the preaching of the Cross is necessary, but that in the millennial kingdom there will be no preaching of the Cross. "There is not a ray of grace in it (the millennium), nor a drop of blood," says Scofield (233). The Sermon on the Mount, which was offered as the standard to the Jewish people and rejected by them two thousand years ago, will become the constitution for the future kingdom. The Gospel is only an "*interim* revelation." Dispensationalism is a theological enigma. Dispensationalists are adherents of the Gospel, and yet because of their eschatological dreaming they actually elevate the Law above the Gospel and thus become thorough-going anti-Gospelists.

What will be the message of the great missionaries during the Jewish kingdom? Some dispensationalists claim that the Christians of the present dispensation must do as much mission work among the Jews as possible and gain many of them for the Gospel so that they will preach some elements of the Gospel when they take over as a nation in the millennium. (This undoubtedly accounts for the great interest in Jewish missions by most dispensationalists.) According to Scofield, the Old Testament cultus will be re-established in

the millennium. He says that the sacrificial offerings will be a memorial looking back to the Cross, as the offerings of the Old Covenant were anticipatory (247). Dispensationalists ought to study the Letter to the Galatians. Even the work of the Holy Spirit will be suspended entirely during the kingdom age or, as Gaebelien holds, will take on a different character (322). Dispensationalism says in effect: "A more acceptable time, a far greater day of salvation is at hand, and may be ushered in at any moment" (262). F. E. MAYER

The Limitations of Christian Preaching

By JOHN H. C. FRITZ

The objective which one seeks to accomplish and his means for that purpose determine the limitations of his doing. The practice of medicine is limited to a correct diagnosis of the case under consideration and the drugs or other remedial agents that will, if possible, effect a cure. A physician may relate some interesting news events to his patient, speak of his own experience in the recent war, and crack a few good jokes that will produce a hearty laugh, but that will not cure the patient of his tuberculosis or pneumonia or tonsilitis. For the production of a good painting an artist is limited to his colors, brushes, and canvass. The lawyer pleading a case before a jury is limited to the facts in the case and the laws covering it. The mason is limited in his work to stone, brick, trowel, mortar, and plumb line. The cook is limited to food-stuff, cooking utensils, and fire.

I

Even so Christian preaching has its limitations. That is in the very nature of the case. The limitations of Christian preaching are that it be *Christian* preaching and therefore take its material from the Word of God and use exposition, example, illustration, and, of course, language itself, to impress the Bible message upon the hearer. Only such preaching will serve the purpose of Christian preaching, to wit, "to make man wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus" (2 Tim. 3:15). The important thing in a sermon is the

Biblical message; if that has not been impressed upon the hearers, preaching has failed to serve its purpose. The Biblical message and its application constitute the limitations of Christian preaching.

Jesus summed up His preaching by saying, "Repent ye, and believe the Gospel" (Mark 1:15). The sinner needs to be told that he is a sinner, under the curse of the Law; but when he has learned to despair of his own righteousness, then he should be comforted by the Gospel of salvation, for "God so loved the world that He gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through Him might be saved" (John 3:16-17).

Paul gave a summary of his preaching when he said to the elders, or pastors, at Ephesus, "I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have showed you and have taught you publicly and from house to house, testifying both to the Jews and also to the Greeks repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ" (Acts 20:20, 21); or, when writing to the Corinthians, he said, "I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified" (1 Cor. 2:2).

Peter spoke of the content of his preaching when in his pentecostal sermon at Jerusalem he said, "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ. . . . Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost," (Acts 2:36, 38); or when he said before the Jewish Council, "There is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved" (Acts 4:12).

In other words, all true preaching must be Christocentric preaching. But does this demand not put too great a limitation upon preaching, excluding much subject matter of the Bible which God would have us teach? How can I preach a Christocentric sermon if I preach on such Biblical subjects as creation, the angels, marriage, stewardship, etc.? It is right here where some preachers make a big mistake; they leave Christ out of such sermons, and by doing so their preaching falls short of the purpose of the Christian sermon. Let them

learn of Paul how to preach a Christocentric sermon on Christian stewardship (2 Cor. 8:1-9). Paul makes Christ and His redemptive work the motivating power for the exercise of Christian stewardship. Let them learn of Paul how to preach a Christocentric sermon on marriage (Eph. 5:22-33). Let them learn of Paul how to fit the subject of creation into a Christocentric sermon (Acts 17:22-31). Let them learn from the writer to the Hebrews which part the angels play in God's economy of man's salvation (Heb. 1:6-7). I can pray that God should send His angels to guard me and my home during the night, because God has given that promise to me as a Christian, a believer in His Son, Jesus Christ.

Such Christocentric preaching produces not only saving faith, but also the fruits of that faith, the Christian life; and that the Christian might know what fruits faith must bring forth, Jesus and the Apostles included such directives for the Christian life in their preaching (Matt. 5-7; Rom. 12 ff.; Gal. 5:13 f.).

Christocentric preaching also gives to the believer the necessary comfort in all tribulations and trials and vicissitudes of life, for it assures him that, since he is a child of the heavenly Father, God is always mindful of him and is willing, ready, and able to help, so that the child of God knows that "all things work together for good to them that love God" (Rom. 8:28); and the believer therefore can joyfully say with Paul, "If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not his own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?" (Rom. 8:31-32).

The summary of such Christian preaching is the summary of what the Bible teaches, as Paul says, "From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness" (2 Tim. 3:15-16); and, again, "Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope" (Rom. 15:4). After all has been said, Christ's summary of His own preaching, "Repent ye and believe the Gospel," is the summary of Christian preaching.

II

Because preaching has such definite limitations, some preachers seek elsewhere for greater variety of subject matter and introduce into their "sermon" what has no place in Christian preaching. Some are tempted to think that they need something more interesting and exciting wherewith to regale and hold their audiences. What unfaithfulness to the Lord! How detrimental to the Christian congregation! What foolishness on the part of the preacher!

There is nothing more interesting and more beneficial and even more exciting than the Christian message, for that supplies the greatest need of man. That message is always timely, never grows old.

When sermon work grows stale to the preacher — and, of course, then his preaching also to his congregation — the difficulty lies not in a lack of material nor in a lack of variety of presentation, but in the preacher himself. Such a preacher does not study his Bible, nor does he know the needs of his people. His sermon work is a mere matter of routine. He talks for half an hour, more or less, because he is expected to do so. His lack of inspiration is due to a lack of perspiration. Great things cannot be accomplished without great effort. The preacher who diligently studies the Bible, not only the New, but also the Old Testament, knows human nature, is alive to the conditions of the time in which he and his people live, is aware of the particular needs of his congregation, such a preacher will never lack an abundance and variety of sermon material, nor a variety of presentation, and his sermons will always be fresh and interesting to his people — and to himself. The limitations of Christian preaching cannot be blamed for the proverbial expression that something is "dull as a sermon." The violinist has only four strings on his violin, but what marvelous music he can produce on these four strings by a variety of tones and a variety of combinations. How does he accomplish this? By daily practice, by advancing from easier to more difficult compositions, and from one position to the next on his violin, until he has mastered all seven. But, after all, he has only four strings on which to play; that is his limitation and at the same time the challenge to his skill. For the more substantial part of a meal a cook must stay with meat and potatoes and vegetables and breadstuffs,

and yet a good cook can prepare these in a variety of ways, so that her meals will always be relished and create an appetite for more. Even so the preacher need not deplore that his preaching has definite limitations, for these limitations do not cramp, but rather enlarge his usefulness.

Read the discourses of Jesus. What a variety of presentation in simple language: similes, metaphors (the sermon on the Mount has fifty-six of them), parables. Jesus spoke to the Sadducees and Pharisees, to the unbelieving Jews, to His disciples, but how differently! He spoke to Nicodemus, to the Samaritan woman, to the woman taken in the very act of adultery, but how differently! He spoke to Martha and Mary on different occasions: rebuke, comfort, commendation; yet always does He speak of the one thing needful. He meets little children and has a word for them. Midst His greatest agony He had a kind word for His mother, an assuring promise for the penitent thief, and a prayer for His crucifiers. He spoke with authority, and the people heard Him gladly.

The sayings and pronouncements of the Prophets of the Old Testament contain not only a wealth and depth of thought, but also a variety of presentation, so that their writings compose some of the choicest specimens of literature. Of the book of the Prophet Nahum, *e. g.*, De Wette says, "It is a classic in all respects." Brice calls it "the most vivid and passionate fragment of declamation in all literature." The same can be said of the writings of the Apostles.

Of course, if the preacher does not study all this and does not keep ever at it, we can well understand that he passes up not only a rich source of sermon material, but also that source from which he can well learn to present the old truths in a new and interesting and profitable way.

All this, of course, does not mean that a preacher should not read and study ancient and modern literature and the sermons of great preachers, also current newspapers and magazines, in order that he may learn what men are thinking and how they live, and that he may enlarge his vocabulary, find new illustrations, etc. When Jesus spoke to the people of His day, He referred to things with which they were acquainted: a yoke of oxen, a vineyard, a laborer's penny a day, etc. We may take examples and illustrations from things with which the people of our day are acquainted: the radio, the airplane, the atomic bomb, etc.

III

Finally, a Christian preacher's faithfulness to his God must determine the limitations of his preaching. God has given to the preacher very definite, explicit instructions. When Jesus sent out His twelve disciples, He said unto them, "What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light; and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the housetops" (Matt. 10:27). Before ascending into heaven Jesus said to His disciples, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature" (Mark 16:15). Again He said, "Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto Me both in Jerusalem and in all Judea and in Samaria and unto the uttermost part of the earth" (Acts 1:8). Through the Apostle Paul, the Lord has given such explicit directions as these to the preacher: "I charge thee therefore before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing and His kingdom: preach the Word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine" (2 Tim. 4:1-2); "hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus" (2 Tim. 1:13). Preaching "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ" serves the purpose of Christian preaching and has the promise of not being done in vain.

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.

The Development of Home Missions in North America

F. C. STREUFERT, Secretary of Missions

(Written at the Request of Synod's Centennial Committee)

As we look back upon the century of Synod's history that will soon be completed and think of the developments both in the history of our country and of our Church, we stand in wonderment. We marvel at the tremendous changes in every phase of activity, be it in the social, in the economic, in the political, or in the scientific field. It was a century that saw at its beginning the westward trek of the pioneer by oxcart

and by covered wagon and at the close the use of the streamlined train, the auto, the airplane, the radio, and television. But in the midst of this ever-changing panorama there remained the unchanging Christ with the eternal verities, firm and unmovable for all ages to come.

At the beginning of the century our forefathers, bereft of the pure ministry of the Word and Sacrament by faith, left their homeland in quest of religious liberty. They came to the shores of our country. Little did they realize the primitive conditions that obtained, the hardships and trials they were to endure. But they remained to pray, to labor, to preach the Gospel, to build the Lord's kingdom.

THE EARLY BEGINNINGS

As soon as the Saxons had settled in Perry County, Missouri, and the Franconians in Michigan, they immediately set about to build their churches and their schools. And they were not content to look after their own spiritual needs only. They immediately sought the spiritual welfare of others also. In this spirit they erected the first seminary at Altenburg, Missouri, for the training of pastors and teachers. Soon they extended their work into the near-by territory. Congregations and mission stations were opened everywhere. In a very short time the number of congregations was doubled. In ten years the number of pastors had increased from 19 to 86; the number of congregations affiliated with Synod, from 30 to 115; and the number of souls, from 4,099 to 20,501.

It is interesting to note that the Saxons reached out not only to the scattered Lutherans but also to the unchurched. Pastor O. H. Walther writes: "An important and very pleasant task for me was the instruction of sixteen adults formerly of the Reformed confession. . . . I received them into the Lutheran Church by confirmation on the Fourteenth Sunday after Trinity in the presence of my colleagues and the congregation." (*Ebenezer*, page 17.) The Christian day school was considered to be a necessity from the very beginning. The first legacy which Synod received was for the *Christiannen-Schule*. That the pastors and members of the respective congregations took such a great interest in the development of God's kingdom was to be expected since it was one of the chief purposes of Synod when it was organized. The

joint extension of the kingdom of God, the training of ministers and teachers for service in the Evangelical Lutheran Church, the distribution of Bibles, of religious periodicals, and of other books were mentioned as the main objects for the organization of Synod. In the very first Synodical convention, held in April 1847, Pastor A. Craemer brought missions to the attention of the synodical body. The matter was thoroughly discussed, and at the close of the convention it was resolved to elect a Mission Board to take care of heathen (Indian) missions. A committee was appointed to outline the instructions for the Board of Missions. In 1848 the following were elected to be the Board of Missions: Pastor H. Fick, chairman; Pastor A. Craemer, secretary; Mr. F. W. Barthel, treasurer. And that all be done in a systematic manner, the Board of Missions received detailed instructions concerning the work to be done. The chairman was instructed not only to supervise the mission stations within Synod but also to give attention to the organization of new stations, and this was to be done, if at all possible, through mission colonies. The secretary was instructed to carry on the correspondence with mission institutions in Europe and with friends particularly interested in the development of missions. He was instructed to submit an annual report, gather statistics, and prepare these for publication. The treasurer was to receive the funds sent by the congregations and he was to disburse these upon orders given by the President. He was instructed to enter all receipts and disbursements, to give receipts, and to prepare the necessary documents, and to report at the annual convention of Synod.

APPOINTMENT OF "VISITORS"

To improve the work of missions Synod appointed so-called *Besucher*. The duties of these "visitors" were to visit German settlements and to locate Lutherans that might be in these settlements. And coming to the various homes of these families, he was to inquire whether they came from Germany or from the eastern part of the United States, how long they had already been in this country, whether the fathers and mothers of those homes were really Lutherans, how many children there were, and how many others lived within these homes, and whether all were baptized, and how

many were already confirmed. They were, however, not to restrict their efforts to the German settlements. The "visitor" was also to visit the English-speaking colonies. He was to ascertain whether these settlements were visited by itinerant sectarian pastors, whether false preachers came to preach to them, and whether the Lutheran settlers also attended these services. The "visitors" were to make a thoroughgoing canvass. They were to inquire whether there were any of the Catholic, of the Reformed, or of the *Unierte* faith, and whether these were visited by pastors of their confession. They were also to inquire whether the Lutheran settlers had Bibles, Catechisms, prayer books, devotional books, and whether they used them. Then, in order that the "visitor" might conduct his work effectively, he was given a brief on missionary methods. He was advised how to make the proper approach when he visited the individual families. He should not create the impression that he was giving them a rigid examination, but he was to carry on a conversation and in this way ascertain their spiritual standing, admonish them, comfort them, and encourage them as it should be necessary.

The "visitor" was to encourage the Lutheran settlers to organize and to call a pastor, provided the number were large enough to do this. If the number were still quite small, the "visitor" was to encourage them to affiliate with one of the near-by Lutheran congregations. The "visitor" was also to admonish fathers and mothers to look after the spiritual needs of their children. And during his stay he was to gather the children and teach them the Catechism, Bible history, etc.

The "visitor" was to take with him literature for distribution. He was to make careful entries into his diary concerning the number of people in the settlement, concerning the surroundings, the personal attitude of such as were one in faith with us. He was instructed to report to the President of Synod at least every two months.

MISSION COLONIES

In 1848 the Board of Home Missions came before the synodical convention and made definite recommendations concerning the conduct of missions. All were agreed that special efforts were to be made to look into mission possibilities and to open such missions with so-called mission colonies.

Already in 1845 we read in *Der Lutheraner*, Vol. I, No. 23, that a mission colony landed on June 9 of that year. This group came from Germany. The colony settled in Michigan in order to open up missions among the Indians. Dr. Walther writes of this endeavor: "This is a very unique undertaking. Here the missionary does not go alone to the heathen people, but he is accompanied by a group of farmers and professionalists, who by their conduct will give an example to the heathen Indians. In this way this group expects to support the preaching of the Word." Rev. Craemer was at the head of this undertaking. Craemer was selected and sent by Loehe, and four other young men (coming from the theological training school of Pastor Loehe) came with him as pastors and teachers to serve Lutherans that had settled in Ohio and in Michigan. Dr. Walther said: "Sie haben zwar keine gelehrte theologische Universitaetsbildung empfangen. Sie sind aber ohne Zweifel von dem gediegenen, rechtschaffenen Pfarrer Loehe in der christlichen Lehre so unterrichtet, dass sie tuechtig sind, auch andere zu lehren, und das ist die Hauptsache."

When in 1848 an extension of Indian Missions was brought to the attention of Synod, Oregon was designated as the place where such activities might be begun. An able candidate or an experienced pastor who could get away from his present charge was to be called. He was to live at St. Louis. St. Louis was chosen because it was the last point west, and because here the Government had its Commission on Indian Affairs. Then, too, it was stated that Indian chiefs came here quite frequently. It was for the missionary to keep in close touch with the Commission on Indian Affairs and to meet with the Indian chiefs in order to gain their confidence. In this way it was hoped that the missionary, together with a group of Christians, could eventually organize a mission colony and advance to the Oregon Territory.

It was deemed advisable to open a mission among the Indians by way of a mission colony. It was believed to be advantageous for the mission development if Christians with their Christian life could influence the heathen world about them and also counteract the evil influences of the sectarian churches, the questionable piety of some of the sectarian denominations, which had long ago been fostered among the

Indians. Not an Indian tribe near by was chosen for opening a mission, but a tribe in the far West, in the State of Oregon, on the shores of the Pacific. It was believed that if a mission could gain a foothold on the Pacific, it would be a stepping-stone for the development of missions on the many islands of the Pacific and of the pagan countries beyond the seas. In 1852 Pastor Loehe announced that Pastor Fleischmann and Mr. Bonetti were planning to bring a mission colony to California and to begin missions among the Chinese of that State. To enable them to carry on this great work, a plea for help was sent to the Mission House in Dresden. They were requested to send two missionaries. But finally, when there was much delay, they were agreed that little assistance for their undertaking could be expected from without. And they resolved that they themselves with the help of God must find ways and means to carry on this work. A Synod-wide appeal was therefore made. The Christians, one and all, were requested "to make this mission endeavor their own." *Missionsstunden* were recommended so that the Christians, being better informed on missions, might be found willing to fill the mission treasury (which at that time had a balance of only \$160).

Synod adopted the recommendations of the Board of Home Missions. But the hopes to take a mission colony and transplant it to Oregon were not realized. An Indian war made it impossible. In 1849 it was reported that the war with the Indians had been concluded in Oregon. The local office on Indian Affairs, however, decreed that there were no possibilities of opening missions among the Indians in Oregon, nor in Missouri, nor in the near-by territory of Iowa. The Kickapoo Indians, so it was reported, were altogether opposed to missions. In the convention of 1852 the *Besucher* reported on his activities in the eastern part of Wisconsin, in Northern Illinois, and in a few places in Indiana and Ohio. In Wisconsin he had found very few Lutherans, and many of those whom he had found were indifferent to the Lutheran Church. But he nevertheless had numerous opportunities to meet with brethren of our faith, to preach to them, and to baptize their children.

In order to take care of the Lutherans in widely scattered areas, particularly in the Western settlements, Synod

called additional "visitors." Pastors Buenger and Ernst were appointed, but at the next convention it was reported that they were unable to carry out the commission given them. New Orleans was also designated as a place that the "visitors" ought to survey. "Visitor" J. Graebner had little success in Michigan. When he came to Lansing, he found few among the professed Lutherans that took a real interest in the Word of God and the Lutheran Church.

EVANGELISTS

In 1857 Pastor Aug. Selle delivered an essay on the calling of evangelists into the service of the Church. The itinerant pastor attached to groups of congregations could not efficiently and with regularity minister to the spiritual needs of the families that settled in faraway territories. Vividly Pastor Selle described the wave of immigration that had literally flooded the country. He stated that in 1857 140,000 immigrants had landed in New York within eight months. The majority came from Germany. He stated that in Minnesota, where only a few years ago settlements had been opened, now one German settlement adjoined the other. Even so it was in Iowa. Of the immigrants many had gone to California, to Kansas, to Nebraska, and to Washington. Pastor Selle asked: "Whose duty is it to follow these settlers? Dare we leave it to the sectarians to serve these immigrants? Dare we postpone action only to come later and find but a scattered few? We believe that these people can be reached if we call evangelists. The evangelist shall not be tied to an individual congregation or to a group of congregations, but his duty shall be to go about to organize Christian congregations wherever this is possible." Pastor Selle, however, emphasized that the evangelist must be carefully chosen. He must be a man of robust health, a young man filled with love to his Lord and God and full of compassion and zeal to win sinners for Christ and His kingdom, a man who would cheerfully take over this work. It was considered a matter of course that he have the necessary theological background and be able to meet *die mancherlei Geister*; he must be tactful, able to adjust himself to conditions as they obtained and to the tasks before him.

With their minds set to gather the Lutheran immigrants

and to minister to their spiritual needs, a Church Directory was published in 1850. This directory contained also a word of warning against the dangers of sectarian churches. To extend the work of missions, Synod then resolved to send out two colporteurs, one to New York City and the other to New Orleans. The duties of these colporteurs were very definitely outlined. It was, however, impossible to carry out this resolution because suitable men to do this work could not be found.

After it had valiantly but unsuccessfully tried to establish mission colonies in different sections of the country, after it had failed to find qualified colporteurs and found that the itinerant-missionary policy did not work out satisfactorily, Synod pointed out that missions and mission expansion is the duty of every pastor, of every congregation, and of every member in its own midst, and that it is the duty of every pastor and of every congregation to extend the work particularly to the adjacent territory. It was pointed out that missions cannot therefore be considered the task of pastors only specifically called for this purpose; all must share in this work; and if all shared therein, the mission treasury would be very much relieved. It was further pointed out that this new missionary policy, however, would be in the interest also of the newly established mission congregations, inasmuch as these new mission parishes would then not be established in faraway, isolated places. It was believed that the young mission stations were in need of close communication with the mother church. This was the underlying reason for the policy that our missionaries in pioneer days did not venture out upon the endless prairies, but settled in woodlands and along water courses, where they found better shelter against the inclemency of the weather. It was the policy of our missionaries never to give up as hopeless any station, no matter how few their hearers were. This practice of being faithful in small things was wonderfully blessed by the Lord. In many localities where fifty to sixty years ago the itinerant preacher would gather about him a few hearers in a small room, there are today large, magnificent churches. (Pfotenhauer, in *Ebenezer*, p. 336.)

Already in 1851 all pastors in Synod were encouraged to direct their attention to the distribution of tracts and Chris-

tian literature. They were always to carry these with them. To encourage pastors to do this, Synod resolved that the missionaries get this literature and charge it to Synod.

ORGANIZING ENGLISH CONGREGATIONS IN 1857

"What measures can and should Synod adopt if the necessity arises to organize English congregations?" was the question ventilated at the synodical convention in 1857. Pastor Biewend delivered a long essay on this topic. The following resolutions were finally adopted: We are not minded to encourage the congregations to rush into the English language; we would rather admonish our German Lutheran Christians to do all in their power to teach their children their mother tongue with the means at hand (sending them to the German Christian day school and using the German language within the homes), so that they might know their mother tongue sufficiently to understand the Word of God in this language in public services and in the books of devotion which are offered by our Church. Yet we believe it to be our sacred duty to organize English congregations as soon as it is apparent that there is a sufficient number of members for the organization of an English congregation, members that understand the English language much better than the German. Synod also agreed that the respective mother churches ought to give real assistance to such newly organized English congregations. Parents and experienced members of a church whose children are in need of the services of an English church ought to join such a church even if they for their own person would not be in need of it.

SALARIES

It is strange to find that when we peruse the history of missions in the early days and of the following decades, no references are made to the salaries of missionaries. We hear of no complaints though the funds to carry on were not always available. It might be interesting to read how Synod in 1854 earnestly admonished the congregations to do their duty to support Synod and its work. We read:

Die Synode sah sich veranlasst, die Nachlaessigkeit und Traegheit vieler Gemeinden im Beitragen zu den Beduerfnissen der Synode ueberhaupt und unserer beiden Lehranstalten insonderheit ernstlich zu ruegen. . . . Es wurde wieder-

holt bemerkt, dass die Schuld gewiss auch zum Teil auf die betreffenden Prediger falle, indem sie ihre Gemeinden nicht ernstlich und fleissig genug dazu ermahnten und anleiteten.

Mehrere Deputierte sprachen sich dahin aus, dass sie es auch als ihre Pflicht erkannten, ihren Predigern in der Ermahnung ihrer Gemeinden beizustehen, damit es besser werde. Einer derselben meinte, dass die Gemeinden wohl nicht wuessten, wie sehr es mangle, und dass sie daher mit dem wirklichen Bedarf besser bekannt gemacht werden sollten.

Der Praeses erwiderte, es lasse sich bei den vielen und mancherlei Beduerfnissen die Summe des Bedarfs so genau nicht bestimmen. Wem aber das Gedeihen der Kirche am Herzen liege, der koenne wohl wissen und erfahren, wie gross der Mangel ueberall sei. Es sei eine Schande, wie wenig manche Gemeinden beitruegen. *Waehrend einige Gemeinden fast ueber Vermoeegen taeten, steckten andere in stinkendem Geize und zeigten eine unverantwortliche Gleichgueltigkeit gegen das Heil und Gedeihen der Kirche.* Diese ihre grosse Undankbarkeit gegen das ihnen so reichlich, lauter und rein dargebotene Wort und Sakrament werde Gott sicherlich damit strafen, dass er ihnen dasselbe wiederum entzoege, wenn sie nicht bezeiten Busse taeten. Die Gemeinden sollten bedenken, wer kaerglich saee, der werde auch kaerglich ernten; wer aber saee im Segen, der werde auch ernten im Segen.

CHANGE OF MISSION POLICY

Until 1853 Synod conducted Home Missions, but when in that year Synod was divided into four Districts, each District was called upon to conduct Home Missions in its respective territory. Then the policy that "every pastor be a missionary" was stressed to a far higher degree. And it spelled success. The pastors were now on the lookout more than ever before to advance to near-by fields. Let us only briefly look at the developments in some areas as pastors and congregations looked about in their community and opened a new mission. In many instances the beginning was made with the opening of a Christian day school. After a Christian day school had been established and the number of families increased in the vicinity, Lenten and Advent services were introduced for the families living in the area involved. Services were held at the schoolhouse on some evening during the week. Later services were held on Sunday afternoons, the pastor of the mother church serving. And when in the course of a year or two the mission developed, a pastor was called, often without the financial assistance of the District Home

Mission Board. Frequently, however, the mother church gave a helping hand. In this way our new missions in the larger cities, as Chicago, St. Louis, Milwaukee, Cleveland, Detroit, and in other places were privileged to see marked developments. Having the mother church sponsor the newly opened mission always proved to be a real incentive and encouragement not only to the members of the mother church, but also to the Christians and the unchurched in the new mission fields as well.

After the organization of separate Districts, Synod continued to carry on all other missions at home and abroad, such as the Deaf and Blind, the European, the South American, and the Foreign Missions in India and in China. Missions among the Negroes in this country and in Africa were and are conducted by the Synodical Conference. Home Missions, however, spread with marked rapidity to every State of the country, from the Canal Zone to provinces of Canada and to Alaska, from ocean to ocean, and to the Hawaiian Islands. And note the various phases of Home Mission developments. In 1932 Synod by resolution transferred the work of the Foreign Tongue, the Jewish, the Indian, the Immigrant, and the Seamen's Missions to the Home Mission Department of the respective Districts in which the work was done. The Foreign Tongue Missions are gradually disappearing. The younger generations speak the English language. The majority of our foreign-tongue churches are for the time being bilingual. For obvious reasons only in Mexico the Foreign Tongue Home Missions have a future. The triennial convention in 1932 authorized the Board of Directors to appoint a secretary of missions. As such he was to be an advisory member to the Board of Foreign Missions, to the Board of European Missions, to the Board of Missions to Deaf and Blind, to the Board for Home Missions in South America, and to the Board for Home Missions in North America. By resolution of Synod he was appointed executive secretary of Synod's Board of Home Missions and of the Board of South American Missions.

INSTITUTIONAL MISSIONS

Since 1896 missionaries have visited the institutions of mercy and the penal institutions in their respective Districts. More than 500 full-time and part-time workers and volunteers

were active in this phase of missions in 1944. — Summer schools, vacation Bible schools, part-time religious instruction, afforded added opportunities to teach the young. — Preaching missions were held in many centers in order to bring the Gospel of Christ to the masses. These preaching missions were usually held in our churches, but also in centrally located public halls or in tents. During the past war Trailer Missions were brought to the fore. The special purpose of a trailer mission is to bring the teachings of the Lutheran Church to the attention of the unchurched in a promising community where we are not represented. Or if we are represented in a given community, the trailer equipment may serve to bring the local congregation to the attention of the people of the community. Trailer missions may also be a means of bringing the Gospel to scattered Lutherans in isolated territories. The equipment of the trailer missions includes a tent, folding chairs, sound amplifiers, movie projector, sound films, strip film projector, mimeograph, camp stove, house trailer, an automobile, and a crew of at least two men. The radio through the Lutheran Hour, KFUD, and many other stations that granted time to our pastors has paved the way and opened many opportunities to lead men and sinners to Christ.

MISSIONS, COLLEGES, UNIVERSITIES

Missions are conducted in nonsynodical institutions of learning, in nurses' training schools, in colleges, and in universities. A vast program to reach out to thousands of students has been developed by the District Home Mission Boards under the guidance and leadership of Synod's Student Service Commission. Eleven colleges and universities, which have a total enrollment of more than 53,000 students, have full-time student pastors. In addition, 419 pastors give part-time service. Approximately 6,500 students and faculty members are being served. Excellent literature for the student pastor is offered. Profitable meetings are held annually by student pastors under the guidance of the Student Service Commission.

MISSIONS CONFERENCES

MISSIONARIES' CONFERENCES

Missions conferences are held annually excepting in the year of Synod's triennial convention. Representatives of the District Home Mission Boards meet to discuss their mutual

problems. Missionaries' conferences are held at regular intervals in nearly all of the synodical Districts. The discussions of practical topics referring to missionary methods and the problems of individual missionaries proved to be a real encouragement to all missionaries participating.

THE TIME OF DEPRESSION AND MISSIONS

Much has been said and written on the depression days of the thirties. But praised be the Lord, those were days for reflection, for a restudy and revaluation of the work done and for a careful survey of new fields and new mission opportunities. Numerous barren fields were closed; others were consolidated. And yet even in those days of stress the Word was not bound; the usual number of new stations were opened annually. We put our house in order and were then ready to do even greater things for the Lord. In spite of the depression there was no retrogression. No missionaries were discharged. But the number of graduates which could for financial reasons not be placed permanently mounted from year to year.

THE CANDIDATE SITUATION

At one time nearly 400 candidates stood idle in the market place for a longer period of time. Not that there was nothing for them to do. All about us souls were dying and going down to eternal perdition. We had mission opportunities everywhere. Realizing this stern fact, the Fiscal Conference established the Candidate Fund to aid District Home Mission Boards and congregations to support candidates in their midst. And what a boon this was to the mission expansion program! In 1938 alone more than 250,000 calls were made by candidates supported by the Candidate Fund and by the District Home Mission Boards. Never before were so many adults gained for membership classes. Never before was there such enthusiasm also on the part of the members to go out into the highways and compel them to come in. Never before were there so many house-to-house canvasses made. Many congregations took on a new lease on life because of the consecrated assistance given their overburdened pastors by the candidates. We realized anew that many of the fields already occupied offer the best mission opportunities, particularly in the populous urban and rural centers. The field fully equipped

with a church, a school, and a parish house, with the organizations for the youth, for men and women, with a day school and a Sunday school, offers an incentive to the unchurched to heed the invitation extended, while new fields far away can at the beginning offer little to attract the fancies of a stranger.

But as we just about emerged from the depression and its difficulties and were coming back to normalcy, on came the most serious conflict the world has ever witnessed.

WORLD WAR II AND HOME MISSIONS

We trembled. Nearly 400 candidates not permanently placed were awaiting a definite call. "Oh, ye of little faith!" said the Lord. We were dismayed. But soon we were to understand why the Lord gave such a large number of pastors and teachers. In the days of stress God quietly prepared his prophets that they might be ready to heed the call in the hour of need. And how quickly did the emergency come. More than 115,000 of our young men were called into the armed forces. 235 pastors entered chaplaincies in the Army and the Navy; 85 took up the duties of pastors in service centers. These together with a thousand key pastors followed our men serving under the Colors to the camp, to the battle front, to the hospital. One by one the candidates stepped into the fields vacated by chaplains and by pastors going to service centers, and into newly established mission fields. And the Lord in a most marvelous way provided the means to support them. Due to the war situation there were upheavals also at home the like of which none had ever experienced. Hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens, among them thousands of fellow Christians, were suddenly uprooted and carried to the far-flung war-created defense projects, often into areas where our Church was not represented. The Board of Home Missions co-operating with the National Advisory Emergency Planning Council, which was created to advise in the many emergencies and developments owing to the war situation, followed with a staff of about 50 pastors, graduates, and student vicars to conserve and keep our members and their families with Christ and His Church. This wartime missions and conservation program made it necessary to erect chapels and places for meetings. In a number of areas this wartime

missions and conservation effort blossomed forth and advanced to permanency. There are still some that will follow. Others are destined to be abandoned after complete demobilization has been effected.

PEACE — POSTWAR PLANS FOR HOME MISSIONS

Plans are now being made for a progressive, systematic, nation-wide mission expansion program. Looking to the future, to the return of the chaplains and pastors in service centers to regular duty; considering the increased enrollment at our colleges and seminaries and the fields which are ripe unto harvest; and considering that the Day of Judgment is at hand, we dare not tarry, we must make ready that all of the men the Lord will place at our disposal will go out to possess the land also in the Home Mission field. For Home Missions are, after all, the most important, the very foundation, the very life line of missions everywhere.

Standing on the threshold of a new century, the Board for Home Missions in deepest gratitude gives all glory and honor to the Lord, and to the Lord alone, for the untold blessings He has placed upon his messengers as they individually and jointly carried out the Great Commission. The work, however, and the task placed upon us is not ended. There are still untold numbers about us without Jesus Christ, without hope, and without salvation. We must therefore continue.

The Board for Home Missions is therefore about to break ground and enter upon an intensive systematic nation-wide Home Mission expansion program. May it please the Lord to instill a greater zeal, an earnest passion, for souls, a live interest in missions in every District, in every circuit, and in every congregation. May the suggestions of the Board for Home Missions materialize. A careful systematic survey of every city, town, and hamlet, of every rural area, is suggested. The relative importance of the respective fields is to be established, and the fields for operation and for the expansion of the work of the Lord are to be judiciously chosen.

In order to unify the work of Home Missions, to strengthen and develop it, a technical, professional magazine, a trade journal, *Missions Magazine*, will be published. This magazine shall be the mouthpiece of Synod's Board of Home Missions, of the District Home Mission Boards, and of the missionaries.

Mutual problems, missionary methods, church publicity, church finances, and such other matters in which mission boards, missionaries, and mission stations are mutually interested may be discussed.

Once more looking over the past century in Home Missions, one cannot deny that it was indeed a century of progress, of development, of advancement. Our forefathers were by no means idle and asleep. They were ever up and doing and alert also in missionary methods, leaving nothing undone and untried to win souls for Christ and His kingdom. For the first half of the past century mission work was nearly exclusively done through the medium of the German language as the fathers looked after the spiritual needs of the vast throngs that migrated from German-speaking countries. But since World War I immigration from German-speaking countries ceased. Since then real efforts were made to reach out to the unchurched of the English-speaking groups, and today there is but a sprinkling of congregations using the German language only.

"Hitherto the Lord hath helped us." Praised be His holy name!

St. Louis, Mo.

Homiletics

Outlines on the Standard Epistle Lessons

SEPTUAGESIMA

1 COR. 9:24—10:5

In this text St. Paul encourages us to be victorious Christians. Is that a Christian admonition? Are Christians not already completely victorious? Have they not through the redemption of Jesus Christ triumphed over the kingdom of Satan and become heirs of God? The text does not try to make us unsure of being saved; in fact, it speaks to people who believe surely that through Jesus Christ they are at peace with God (cf. also 10:12). Nevertheless, Paul exhorts,

BE VICTORIOUS CHRISTIANS!

I. Christians still have a battle to fight

II. It is important that Christians fight it victoriously

I

A. Who is our opponent in this battle?

1. St. Paul calls it "the body" (9:27). Every man has this enemy, also every Christian; it is associated with his physical nature. — 2. This does not mean that the physical body is in itself evil and to be despised. (Heb. 13:3-4; 1 Tim. 4:1-5; Gen. 1:31). — 3. But it means that because of innate sin, the drives and cravings of the body go beyond their purpose and are sinful lusts (cf. 10:6-10; 1 John 2:15-17; Rom. 6, *passim*.); they have become masters of man and his spiritual life.

B. Our conflict with this opponent means a real battle.

1. St. Paul uses pictures of intense exertion: "run a race" (v. 24); "strive for mastery" (v. 25, of the wrestling games). The battle takes energy and conscious effort. It is not hard to fall (cf. 10:12; Rom. 7:18-24). — 2. Hence the fighter needs a will to win; he must realize that he has a fight on his hands and that victory is all-important — much more important than in the case of the earthly conflicts which St. Paul uses as illustrations (9:24).

C. For the victory over this opponent we must use the proper strategy.

1. It is disastrous to exert energy on a false issue, "beat the air" (v. 26), or to fall prey to apathy (10:5-6, 12). Hence the importance of being temperate (9:25); guarding against any indulgence of sense or appetite that weakens the hold on the true power (10:14).—2. That power is God Himself, through the Gospel of Christ and the power of the Spirit. Christ's redemption and faith in it fostered by Word and Sacrament are our powers (cf. Rom. 7:25; 1 Cor. 11:28, 30; John 15:5-7).

II

A. This striving for victory is important for every Christian.

1. The Christian may fancy that his contact with other Christians and with the practices of his group may be a safeguard. Yet that alone may leave him impotent before the trials of faith (10:1-12).—2. Hence we may expect God to allow tests and trials of our faith, "temptations for good," which will drive us to a new hold on His supply of power and new faith in Christ as our Savior (10:13).—3. Hence the place in every Christian's life of the struggle between the flesh and the spirit, the need of "keeping under the body." It is a reminder of his need for the One Thing Needful, a barometer for the pressure of faith within him (cf. Small Catechism: Second Petition and Explanation, Sixth Petition and Explanation).

B. This striving for victory is particularly important for the Christian witness.

1. Paul speaks of the folly that would be his if he who preached to others should himself come short in this struggle. He would then be like the broken-down stumblebum lounging around the boxing arena, unable to fight a victorious match, ludicrous to others, and useless in his profession (9:26-27).—2. Not only the Apostle, but every Christian is in the business of bearing witness to the life of God in him through Christ Jesus. For that witness the purity, radiance, victory wrought by the Spirit, is essential (Phil. 2:13-16; 2 Cor. 3:2-3; 1 Pet. 2:11 ff.). Especially our time with its mountainous temptations of lust and materialism for young and old offers this challenge.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

SEXAGESIMA

2 COR. 11:19—12:9

Untrue as well as absurd is the unbelievers' contention: "Since no one has ever returned from heaven to confirm its existence, we cannot be sure of it."

Not only is God's Word surer than the testimony of a million resurrected men, but some have returned to confirm it: Moses, Elijah, and, according to text, Paul, whose ecstatic experience is here described as nothing less than

A VISIT IN HEAVEN

I. How delightful it was II. How certain it was

III. How encouraging it was

I

Text.—Into the third heaven, Paradise (12:2-4), was Paul translated. Whether his soul alone, without body, was "caught up," he could not say. But this itself indicates that there he was free of all bodily ills. The unalloyed happiness of heaven was he experiencing; "unspeakable words" was he hearing. Things so sublime, revelations so transcendent that upon his return to earth he could not and dared not express them! He could only say: "I reckon . . ." (Rom. 8:18).

Application.—Paul's visit thus confirms how delightful is the place Christ has prepared for His own. It transcends all joys He has given them here (Is. 35:10). It is a heaven so sin-free, so perfect, that words cannot describe it (1 Cor. 13:10, 12). Earth's fairest scenes, man's greatest palaces, etc., are but faint shadows.

Illustration.—When shown a millionaire's mansion, a poor woman said: "It is splendid; I thank you for showing it to me; but it is not nearly so beautiful as the house into which I am soon moving." And then she quoted a few verses of 2 Cor. 5. Yes,

Dreams cannot picture a world so fair;
Sorrow and death may not enter there.
Time doth not breathe on its fadeless bloom
Far beyond the clouds and beyond the tomb.

II

Text. — Even critics admit that this account was written by Paul. Nor can they deny that it bears all marks of truthfulness — written by a sane, sober man, himself once an unbeliever converted only by God's intervention, never neurotic or superstitious, but hating delusions of dreamers (2 Thess. 2: 11), always ready to suffer for the truth (11: 23 ff.). And to certify his experience, he calls on God (12: 2; 11: 31: "God knoweth, I lie not"). He even mentions the exact time (12: 2). And remembering that he wrote by inspiration, must we not admit that his heavenly visit was not imaginary, but real, certain?

Application. — How false to say: we have no proof of heaven! How foolish to doubt its reality! No spirit, vision, angel, could certify it so conclusively as by this inspired testimony does faithful Paul, who during his lifetime visited heaven and returned to tell; "I have been there; I have seen Paradise."

Illustration. — Luther, on his deathbed (Feb. 18, 400 years ago): "O heavenly Father, I *know assuredly* that, although I must give up this body and be removed from this life, I shall still abide with Thee eternally."

Bless God, our triumph's sure,
Though long we did endure (444: 3).

III

Text. — With this visit, God meant: "Well do I know your sufferings (11: 24 ff.) are enough to dismay the best missionary. But look, Paul, at this Paradise! This is the heaven to which souls are being led by your Gospel ministry. This is yours; therefore persevere!" An unforgettable encouragement! Was not this the honey with which Paul ate the bread of sorrows? the sugar for his cup of suffering? the stimulant to overcome all weariness, and exult (2 Tim. 4: 7-8)?

Application. — Though our labors, trials, sorrows, temptations, are much smaller than Paul's, is this not written also for our encouragement? What a spur to faithfulness to be assured of that glorious heaven our Savior has graciously bought for us with His blood! (2 Peter 3: 13 ff.)

Illustration.—Caesar (advancing on Rome, seeing the Senate flee): "They that will not fight for this city, what city will they fight for?" But not to strive, not to persevere for the Heavenly City, how much more reprehensible!

Then shame, thou weary soul!
Look forward to the goal (444:2).

ALVIN E. WAGNER

QUINQUAGESIMA SUNDAY

1 COR. 13

The congregation at Corinth was very highly gifted (1 Cor. 1:4-7). Yet lack of love, or, as our Bible translates, charity, manifesting itself in clannishness, petty jealousies, bickerings, disregard and deliberate slights of the poorer brethren, in overstressing certain gifts in their preachers and in striving unduly for spectacular gifts, such as speaking in tongues (ch. 14), threatened to disrupt the congregation. In language rivaling in beauty the choicest products of human pen, the Apostle points out the folly and sinfulness of their behavior and shows them a more excellent way (12:31).

FOLLOW AFTER CHARITY

- I. Lack of love vitiates all other gifts*
- II. Love is the fountainhead of Christian virtue*
- III. Love is the greatest of all divine gifts*

I

Vv. 1-3 emphasize the vital importance of charity, of true Christian love, toward the fellow believers. Lack of love takes the very heart and life out of all other gifts and acts a Christian may boast. Where there is no love toward the brethren, the very first requirement of God's Law is lacking, there remains only an empty shell. Cp. Rom. 13:8-10; 1 John 3:11-19; 4:7-12, 20-21. No matter how gifted, how wise, how wealthy, how influential we may be, what sacrifices we may bring, lacking love, we are nothing! Let us follow after love!

II

Vv. 4-7 picture the glory of Christian love: It is the fountainhead of all Christian virtues. Charity suffereth long, exercises patience as God has patience with us. "Is kind,"

renders friendly, gracious service to all. "Envieth not," without a trace of jealousy it acknowledges, and rejoices in, the accomplishments of others. "Vaunteth not itself," is not a braggart "puffed up" with his own importance. "Doth not behave itself unseemly," does not overstep the limits of gentlemanly, Christian behavior. "Seeketh not her own" (Phil. 2:4-12). "Is not easily provoked," not so intent on its own advantage as to be irritated at any opposition or failure. "Thinketh no evil," does not charge to the neighbor's account the evil done to it by the neighbor. It is grieved when iniquity, or sin, is committed by the fellow Christian and rejoices whenever truth makes progress in the hearts of men, lends a helping hand to such progress. It bears quietly injuries inflicted, has faith in the brethren, hopes for the best, endures willingly all things. Love, indeed, is the fountain-head of Christian virtue. Let us follow after charity.

III

Vv. 8-13. While many valuable gifts cease, love is eternal, outlasting many gifts essential for this life. Love, like Christian faith and hope, "abideth." In this respect love is the equal of that grand trio of indispensable, eternal gifts. And it is the greatest of this trio. Christian faith and hope came into existence only after man had fallen into sin and the Savior from sin had been promised. In the history of man, love antedates Christian faith and hope. Neither is Christian faith and hope an attribute of God, while love is; and the image of God is not restored in the Christian's faith and hope, but in the Christian's love, the fruit and product of faith and hope. It is Christian love that makes the Christian God-like, Christlike. Therefore love is the greatest of these three. Let us strive after this noble gift!

THEO. LAETSCH

INVOCAVIT

2 COR. 6:1-10

Another Lenten Season! What shall we preach? In our text we have

A FITTING EXHORTATION FOR LENT

I. Its Content

A. In the previous chapter (2 Cor. 5) the Apostle reminds us of the grace of God, telling us how it was attained for the whole world in Christ Jesus (2 Cor. 5:19). There he appeals to all, "Be ye reconciled to God" (2 Cor. 5:20). In a similar way we have in previous services told you of this wonderful grace of God. In every sermon we have called on you to accept this wonderful message of mercy, saying, Acts 16:31; Mark 1:15; etc.

B. To those who accept this Gospel invitation the Apostle now directs a special word of exhortation, saying in our text, verse 1.

a. Many do receive God's grace in vain, *e. g.*, those who "for a while believe" (Luke 8:13; Heb. 4:1, 11); those who permit Satan to repossess their souls (Luke 11:24-26); and those who "become entangled with the pollutions of the world" (2 Pet. 2:30). Particularly at this time we think of former confirmands, many of them no longer with us; of "Lenten Christians," who came only for a time, never to return; of those who have endured the trials of this life (war, sickness, poverty, accidents) and under these trials have learned to accept Christ, but who, now that the dangers are over, have lapsed into their old ways of indifference and neglect. Hence, we, too, have reason to exhort all our people, and particularly also our catechumens, in this present season of Lent, saying, verse 1.

b. In the context, and in other Scriptures as well, the Lord tells us how we may give heed to this exhortation, namely, by avoiding evil fellowship (2 Cor. 6:13-18), by fighting sin and fleeing from it (2 Cor. 7:1; Heb. 3:12-13; 1 Cor. 10:1-13), by abiding in Christ and in His Word (John 15:4-8; 8:31-32) and so bringing forth much fruit. Let us follow the advice of our Lord and so give heed to our text (v. 1).

II. Its Characteristics

A. It is urgent. The Apostle uses a strong term (v. 1). We do not merely "pray you" (2 Cor. 5:20), he says, but, as co-workers with God, we, like God, "beseech you," lit., "exhort you" (cp. 2 Cor. 5:20; 6:1). We, therefore, as your pastors and as "co-workers with God," just as urgently exhort you in this present Lenten season (v. 1).

B. It is timely (v. 2). The point of the parenthetical phrase is this: God had promised to hear Messiah's prayer on our behalf and for our salvation (Is. 49:8); and since, in Christ, the Messiah has come and through His substitutionary work has made (John 17; Luke 23:23) and still continues to make intercession in our behalf (Rom. 8:34; Heb. 4:14-15; 7:24-25), it follows that we ought to accept Him and to heed the exhortation of our text now (v. 2 b).

C. It is offered with evident sincerity. If ever there is proof of sincerity in the exhortation of men, it is manifest here. The Apostle admonishes as one who is as he describes himself in vv. 3-4 and supports his claim by "much patience" in hardships, v. 4 b (Acts 9:16; 2 Cor. 1:6; 4:7; 7:7; 2 Tim. 4:10), v. 5 a (Acts 11:23; 13:50; 14:5, 19; 16:22; 17:5; 18:12; 19:29; 21:30; 22:24; 2 Cor. 11:16-33), v. 5 b (1 Thess. 2:9; 2 Thess. 3:8; 1 Cor. 4:11; Acts 20:31; 14:25; cp. Eph. 6:18; Phil. 4:12); by exhibiting the Christian graces of vv. 6-7; and by bearing both good and evil in a manner befitting his calling, vv. 8-10 (Acts 17:18; 24:14; 27:21; 28:22; 2 Cor. 1:8; 3:22; 12:7; Phil. 3:4-10; 4:4). Surely, in the face of such evidence one cannot question the sincerity of St. Paul's appeal! But should not our exhortations be equally sincere, attested to by similar evidence in our lives?

Conclusion: If through the temptation of Satan and in the weakness of our flesh we have at times sinned against the admonition of v. 1, let us find our comfort in Christ Jesus, who as our Messiah and Substitute perfectly overcame the Tempter for us (Matt. 4:1-11; Heb. 4:14-16), so that we were made "the righteousness of God in Him" (2 Cor. 5:20). And may this merciful kindness of our Savior, granted to us by faith, cause us to extend this exhortation of our text with the same urgency, timeliness, and sincerity as did Paul, not only during this season of Lent, but always. Amen.

THEODORE F. NICKEL

Miscellanea

An Additional Note on Acts 16:12

The statement by myself quoted in the October, 1945, number of this journal (XVI, No. 10, pp. 697—98)¹ was written as a footnote to an article on Hellenistic political institutions ("Representation and Democracy in Hellenistic Federalism," *Classical Philology*, XL [1945], 65—97. At one point it was maintained, on the basis of epigraphical evidence, that the four republics into which Macedonia was divided in 167 B. C. continued to exist under the Roman Empire. It may interest readers that this point, frequently overlooked by historians, has been given fuller treatment in the literature on the Acts of the Apostles. The technical name for one of these republics was *μερίς* ("part"). My own chief interest in Acts 16:12 was the conviction that in this passage also the word must be the technical term for one of these "parts" of Macedonia. Scholars familiar with the literature will have observed that no effort was made to cite all critical editions but merely those which contain material of special importance for the problem. Moreover, they may have noticed that I was guilty of one serious omission in overlooking A. C. Clark, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Oxford, 1933). In this edition the text of the passage and critical notes appear on p. 101 and a further discussion on pp. 362—65. This omission was particularly unfortunate, since Clark, from my point of view, has the correct interpretation of *μερίς*. His treatment of the passage, however, in other respects, too, differs radically from that of Ropes and involves several problems which, for the sake of completeness, should be noted. From the point of view of my earlier statements the result will be in part a palinode, but, on the other hand, additional support for the interpretation of *μερίς* already given.

My discussion was written from the point of view that the best manuscript tradition is represented by Codex Vaticanus, which, according to Ropes, for the passage under consideration reads: Φιλίππους, ἧτις ἐστὶν πρώτη μερίδος τῆς Μακεδονίας πόλις, κολωνία. The approach of Clark to the problem of the relative values of the manuscripts is entirely different. It is his contention that the best evidence for the text is not to be found in Codex Vaticanus (B) and Sinaiticus and related manuscripts on which the traditional text has been based, but in a group of slightly longer manuscripts, incorrectly called "Western," of which Codex Bezae (D) is the most important. It has been held that the additional material in these manuscripts is due to interpolation. Clark, on the other hand, maintains that the shorter text has been formed from the earlier and longer text through omissions. D is written

¹ An unfortunate typographical error may be noted. In the reference to Livy near the bottom of p. 697 change XIV to XLV.

in "sense lines," and the sections omitted in the shorter version often correspond to one or more of these lines. The evaluation of the details of this argument must be left to specialists. To me, though I am not qualified to judge, Clark's position seems very strong. The shortening of a text through omissions seems more likely than its conscious expansion through interpolation. On the other hand, there are omissions also in D. In Clark's text such passages are printed between two asterisks. Material from D not included in the shorter manuscripts is printed in blacker type (cf. Clark, *op. cit.*, p. xi). For the passage under consideration D gives:

ητις εστιν κεφαλη μακεδονιας
πολις κολωνια

With this can be compared the reading of B given above. Clark's text is:

ητις εστιν κεφαλή* τῆς
πρώτης μερίδος* τῆς Μακεδονίας,
πόλις κολωνία.

Here the one word derived from D, with some support from Syriac manuscripts, is κεφαλή. If D is regarded as an inferior manuscript, it is natural to take this as a substitute for πρώτη, as was done by me. If, however, D represents a good tradition, it should be retained. Yet, as Clark points out, also the words πρώτη μερίδος must be retained. (For πρώτη rather than πρώτη see Clark and my earlier statement.) Though the two words are omitted in D, there is sufficient evidence in other manuscripts, and, if the prototype of D was written with the division into lines shown by Clark, their omission can readily be explained on the supposition that the scribe passed from one line to the corresponding position in the next line. What, then, is the meaning of κεφαλή? "Capital" would be incorrect historically. Clark, however, presents sufficient evidence to prove that the word can mean "extremity," "apex," or "frontier town." If we change the last term to "frontier city" and interpret "city" (*polis*) to include not only the city proper but also its territory, then Philippi can be described correctly as a frontier city. In at least one other passage in ancient literature it is described as a city bordering on Thrace. On the south its territory reached to the sea. Neapolis, where Paul landed, was on the territory of Philippi, was the harbor town of the latter city and stood somewhat in the same relation to it as Piraeus did to Athens. Thus, though Paul landed at Neapolis, it was natural and correct to describe Philippi as a frontier city of Macedonia. Though it may seem surprising to find the account so detailed, it was equally correct to describe it as a frontier city of the first *meris* of this province. (For the relation of Neapolis to Philippi, see Paul Collart, *Philippis* [Paris, 1937], pp. 283, 493, and *passim*; for Philippi as a city bordering on Thrace, see Galen as quoted by Collart, p. 514, n. 2.)

One additional point in Clark's discussion calls for a remark, namely, the implication that the division of Macedonia into four

parts was suppressed in 148 B. C., when Macedonia was made a province, but was later restored. This seems based on the supposition that the creation of a province meant the suppression of older arrangements. A direct continuity is much more likely. Macedonia had paid taxes since 167 and had been closely watched by Rome. The establishment of a province need mean little more than that thereafter a representative of Rome—the governor—was always on hand to take over this supervision permanently. I have dealt with this point briefly in *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* (ed. T. Frank), IV (Baltimore, 1938), 303. In addition to the general impression of the policy of Rome during the period of expansion in the East (cf. M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* [Oxford, 1941], pp. 1016 f.), there is for Macedonia direct evidence that the laws of Aemilius Paulus, who had supervised the reorganization of 167 B. C., remained in force at the time of Augustus (Livy XLV, 32, 7; Justin XXXIII, 2, 7). Thus, when also the divisions of the country set up by him are found under the Empire, continuous existence must be taken for granted.

University of Chicago

J. A. O. LARSEN

Stewardship of Time

In the *Watchman-Examiner* the Rev. A. N. Meckel of Braintree, Mass., discusses the topic "Are Ministers Lazy?" Having extracted some profit from the article for ourselves, we thought it proper to pass it on to the brethren.

"I think that the average minister is lazy!" That bald statement was not made by a minister of his fellow craftsmen; it was made in the midst of a conversation by a churchwoman. She continued her indictment as follows: "One finds such mentally groomed and vocationally alert men among physicians, for instance. One admires their precision, their discipline, their sense of competence. In these respects, they seem so unlike many of our pastors."

One's first impulse is resentment—strong resentment—at such a blanket indictment of one's profession. And yet, is there a modicum of truth in it? Are ministers lazy? There was something in the words of this woman and the manner in which they were spoken that sent one away with the query of the conscience-stricken disciples of Jesus in mind: "Lord, is it I?" The writer remembers the insistent question that was asked his wife by a Boston census taker. "Yes, I understand that your husband preaches on Sunday; but what does he do during the rest of the week?" And then, of course, my brother ministers will have inwardly rankled at the statement of not a few well-meaning parishioners: "Tomorrow (Sunday) is your busy day, isn't it?" As though week days were vacation days.

Just recently someone mentioned a youth who was considering the Christian ministry as a life vocation for the reason that he thought it much less demanding than that of law or medicine.

Let us be frank to admit it: not a few persons consider ours a relatively comfortable calling. We are, by and large, our own bosses and can go and come much as we please. And if there is any least tendency of laziness in us, we can get by—that is, for a time! Granted, we are not thinking now of that little fringe of souls everlastingly anxious about our state of health, warning us of overwork, and wanting to send us away for a long rest. One can only pity the man who takes such counsel too much to heart.

The minister of the Gospel might well give an account of his stewardship, of the time entrusted to him for his task. Here are a few test questions he might well put to himself.

How much time does he conscientiously and deliberately give to the culture of the inner life; to prayer and communion with the source and sustenance of his being, to quiet brooding over and feeding upon the Word of Life? Surely, nine o'clock in the morning will find him in his study, with the door shut, and beginning the day with God. Wherever in the day's schedule he may have to hurry, he will bear in mind that "haste makes waste" here. We must get into spiritual focus before we can lead another in the kingdom of God. The future, at least as far as the ministry is concerned, belongs to the disciplined. "When we read the lives of the saints," says E. Herman, "we are struck by a certain large leisure which went hand in hand with a remarkable effectiveness. They were never hurried. — *They lived in God.*" (*Creative Prayer*, p. 28.) Yes, our supreme task is to know God intimately as a Friend and Companion; only so can we reveal a sense of the Presence to others.

Every morning lean thine arm a while
Upon the window sill of heaven, and gaze upon thy God.
Then with the vision in thy heart
Turn strong to meet the day!

How does he husband his time with regard to the reading and assimilating of essential books and periodicals? Does the tidal movement of the best thought sweep through him? Is he oriented to the thought and movement of life of his day? Much current reading, as Nels Ferré has said, is a waste of time, is sin. And although many of us may differ as to what should come first on our "must list," nevertheless, there is an essential core of knowledge which belongs to our calling. Certainly, the ministerial mind needs to nibble constantly on something solid in the field of theology. It needs to research continually in that inexhaustible fountain of wisdom and inspiration, the Holy Bible. Good books in the philosophical sector are an aid to the stretching of flabby mental muscles. And biography—the-coming-to-know the great souls who blazed spiritual paths before us—surely that kind of reading is indispensable. If God has no use for a clerical "busy-body," neither can He profitably employ a mere "bookworm." Urbanity of mind, however, is a far different and necessary thing.

How much time does the minister conscientiously employ in pastoral counseling and visitation? Dr. R. W. Dale, of Birmingham, frankly admitted that he had no taste for pastoral work. He deliberately set himself to cultivate a sympathetic and friendly disposition. It was said of Ian Maclaren that, long after his greatest sermons were forgotten, his kindly visits and his bedtime stories, told to some little bairn that was sick, still stood out in memory. We know of a pastor who lately told his congregation that he desired to visit personally the home of every serviceman who was returning from the armed forces.

But alas for the well-meaning man who dawdles and gossips instead of visiting systematically. The last state of his congregation and church is worse than the first. It is not that it is necessary for all ministers to have set hours for counseling or even calling. It is rather that this vital sector of the total task should be carried out deliberately and systematically. Our people know instinctively whether or not, like the Great Shepherd, we go among them "doing good." Recall the beautiful words spoken by George W. Truett at the time that he refused the presidency of a college: "I have found the shepherd heart, and I am content."

It is quite likely in his preaching on the Lord's Day that a minister gives account of his stewardship. The fruitage, or the lack of a life "hid with Christ in God," of his earnest reading, of his work as pastor, will reveal themselves there. Is there a cutting edge of his message, a thrusting relevance to the needs, the sorrows, the frustrations, the joys of his people? Are his words—after the high pattern of his Master—"spirit and life"? All in all, it is a watershed experience for both pastor and congregation. Remember the apostolic pattern of preaching. Paul deliberately eschews any academic pretense, but makes the bold claim that his preaching is "in demonstration of the Spirit and with power." Aye, there is the test, and it ought to humble the heart of each and all of us. Surely, in days like these, it is no small thing to speak as "a dying man to dying men."

Was it not Arthur John Gossip who said that whenever he begins the act of ascending his pulpit on Sunday morning, it were as though a Presence met him at the pulpit stairs and put to him the question, "Are you bringing My people *your very best*?" True, we cannot always reply to that test question in the affirmative. There is an intangible tidal quality, an ebb and a flow, in the soul's hidden life, as Martineau long ago said. But at such times it is precisely the spiritually disciplined and prepared who come off the best. You have heard, of course, of the Scottish divine who was "invisible on week days and incomprehensible on Sundays." To be able to look into the face of the Lord of Life on the Lord's Day and say, "I have done my best"—that is as much as any of us can say.

The question, then, as to whether or not ministers are lazy must be answered in the deeps of every man's own heart. Regardless of the fact that he punches no time clock and does not labor

under the immediate auspices so well known to many of his congregation, there is a stewardship which he must and does render. Perhaps the far-seeing Lincoln had our calling and profession in mind when he said in effect, "You can fool some of the people some of the time, but not all of the people all of the time!" A.

Church Order and the Confession

Translator's Note: A few preliminary words on the source of the document here submitted may be of interest. The mimeographed original bears no indication of authorship. However, the circumstances under which it came into my hands bear testimony that its author is someone high in the councils of the Bavarian Lutheran Provincial Church. The circumstances are the following: I had requested the opportunity of an interview with Dr. Meiser, *Landesbischof* of Bavaria, when he next came to Ansbach. The opportunity came on the evening of August 24 when Dr. Meiser was on his way to the meeting of German Church leaders to be held at Treysa in Hesse-Cassel. We touched on many topics during the two-hour conversation, and at the end Dr. Meiser promised to send me documents relative to some of the subjects we had covered. Among the bundle of documents I received the next day was "Kirchenordnung und Bekenntnis." Its contents expands some of the ideas Dr. Meiser had presented to me as his aim in the reorganization of the Protestant Church in Germany, which was to be the purpose of the conference in Treysa. For that reason it is historically valuable in showing the stand taken by the conservative Lutheran theologians in Bavaria regarding the reorganization of the Church in Germany.

WALTER C. DAIB

A.

I. How far is the outward organization of the Church determined by its confession?

1. We understand "outward organization" to mean all legal¹ regulation of church affairs, all church "order,"² church government.

2. The essence of the Church as described in Augsb. Conf. VII lies so fully in the sphere of "spirit," "faith," and "love" that it leaves no room for legal regulations which are found in the sphere of civil righteousness (*iustitia civilis*) and therefore also in the sphere of the law, of expedience, and of common sense.

3. Nevertheless, the opinion that the Church can and dare not adopt a legal organization is mistaken, for such an opinion mistakenly separates the visible from the invisible Church and in particular fails to take into consideration the fact that God has established in the Church the *ministerium docendi evangelii et porrigendi sacramenta* (Augsb. Conf. V). The administration of this office is to proceed "orderly and honorably" (Augsb. Conf. XIV, XV, XXVIII). Above all, provision must be made that the

¹ "Legal," *rechtlich*, refers not merely to civil law, but to any rule, or regulation, imposed by a church, or congregation, upon itself for the orderly conduct of its affairs.

² "*Ordnung*" in this translation will sometimes be rendered with "order," sometimes with "government," sometimes with "organization," depending upon the context.

Gospel is preached purely and the Sacraments are administered in accordance with their institution, i. e., "order" is necessary both for the office of Gospel proclamation and for the congregation in which and through which the Gospel is proclaimed.

4. Because the only purpose for all church "order" is to safeguard the function of the proclamation of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments in accordance with the confession, all order in the Church has merely an auxiliary function. An emphasis on order which takes it out of this auxiliary position is contrary to the confession, which speaks of order merely in a very loose and unemphatic way (which may be observed without sin and which are profitable unto tranquillity and good order in the Church) and always with the caution: "Consciences are not to be burdened."

5. Even though it is by divine law (*iuris divini*) that "orders" are established in and through the congregation for the safeguarding of the proclamation of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments in accordance with the confession, yet the forms which this government assumes in individual cases are not divinely authorized, but merely human (Augsb. Conf. XXVIII).

6. While no form of church government therefore has, as such, divine sanction, yet certain forms of church government can be or become erroneous. That is always the case if church orders

- a. make impossible the administration of the means of grace in accordance with the confession;
- b. are to be valid regardless of their binding relation to the task of Gospel proclamation in accordance with the confession;
- c. are instituted or administered by persons who themselves are not bound by the confession of the Church; and
- d. if the claim is made regarding such forms of church government that they must by divine right be so constituted as they are.

7. (To 6a): The Church is not bound by "orders" which make the valid administration of the means of grace impossible. In such cases the emergency powers of the Church are called into existence (*Tractatus de potestate et primatu Papae*).

8. (To 6b): Contradictory to the confession is a situation in which the "order" in a church government begins to exist for its own sake and the church government is granted unconditional power of command analogous to a civil government. (Cf. 4 and 5.)

9. (To 6c): The later development of "State Church" church government was in many cases just as incompatible with the confession as the modern arrangement of "finance sections."³ It is

³ "Finance section" evidently refers to an arrangement by which the tax-gathering offices of the State, in which the State alone controls the personnel employed, collect the dues imposed by the Church upon its members.

false doctrine to claim that the outward organization of the Church can, may, or even must provide offices which are not bound by the confession of the Church.

10. (To 6d): The claim that the outward organization of the Church must by divine right take a certain form has been advanced at various times in the Lutheran Church,

a. as a demand for a democratic parliamentary organization of the congregation on account of the general priesthood of believers, and

b. as a prerogative of the clergy to lead the congregations of the Church with the power of command, i. e., to be a church government by divine right.

11. (To 10a): The general priesthood of believers certainly exists, also in the confession, but not as a constitutive principle of church government. A democratic parliamentary form of organization can certainly be the expedient order at times in order to safeguard the proclamation of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments in accordance with the confession, but such a form is to be rejected if it is demanded as a matter of divine right.

12. (To 10b): Every holder of the office of Gospel proclamation leads the congregation with God's Word by divine right *non vi, sed verbo*. To assign to him the leadership with power of command within the framework of the outward organization in whole or in part may at times be very expedient but dare not be demanded as a matter of divine right, since all leadership with power of command in the Church is a human arrangement.

13. (To 10b): In the same way it may be very expedient at times (and is so now) to place the leadership of the Church, with power of command within the framework of the outward organization, into the hands of certain prominent clergymen (office of bishop). But to claim such leadership as a divine prerogative for the whole clergy or for individual prominent members of the clergy is incompatible with the confession, which, incidentally, knows nothing at all concerning legally established differences in rank in the office of the Gospel ministry.

14. The confession acknowledges the function of Gospel preaching and administering of the Sacraments as the only divinely ordained office of the Church. But just as the office may by human arrangement take various forms in individual cases, so also its functions may be distributed over several offices. That is to say: In the Church only the office of Gospel proclamation exists by divine right, but it is not a divine command that there be in the church only one office.

15. Finally, we can derive from the confession a guide in procedure when the outward organization of the Church must be changed. In such a case we are not to change the outward form as much as possible, but rather transform the present organization by the removal of those things which according to par. 6 are or have become false.

II. In which points must the differences in organization become evident in accordance with the Lutheran and Reformed confessions?

1. The Lutheran and the Reformed Churches answer differently the question how far the outward organization of the Church is determined by its confession.

- a. For the Lutheran Church the outward organization is a human arrangement as long as its auxiliary position over against the task of Gospel proclamation is maintained. For the Reformed Church a certain form of organization, namely, the presbyterial-synodical system, is viewed as divinely authorized and therefore constitutive.
- b. In the Lutheran Church all church organizations are bound by the confession, while in the Reformed Church even the confession is subject to the doctrinal pronouncements of a regularly called synod.

2. The difference indicated in par. 1a need not always become evident immediately in the outward organization. The freedom of the Lutheran Church to establish any form of outward organization is not to be misconstrued in a legalistic way as though the Reformed form of church government could never be accepted. Indeed, at times that may be the expedient thing to do.

Yet the Lutheran Church

- a. will always retain for itself the full freedom to change and
 - b. will decline or abolish individual church orders if their acceptance or retention must be viewed as agreement with the claim that such church orders are divinely authorized,
- while the Reformed Church

- a. would not be likely to refrain from emphasizing the assumption that their constitutional organization is divinely authorized, and
- b. on the other hand, could not participate in those forms of church organization which, like the office of bishop, must seem to be contrary to their confession, and
- c. would never acknowledge the guiding principle indicated in A, I, par. 15.

3. The difference indicated in par. 1b need also not appear in the constitution in express terms. The provision that doctrine is not a valid sphere of legislative powers, frequently found in Lutheran church orders, is of doubtful legal value and therefore cannot be insisted upon unconditionally. Nevertheless Lutherans would undoubtedly favor such express provision, while the Reformed would certainly decline it.

III. What do we understand Holy Scripture to say on these points?

1. That the Lutheran Confessions deliberately mention nothing of a divinely ordained form of church government agrees entirely with Holy Scripture. The New Testament shows a very diversified picture of constitutional organization. In Corinth everything is

charismatic without ordered ministers; elsewhere elders are ordained (Acts 14:23; 20:17; 1 Pet. 5:1); again elsewhere there are bishops and deacons (Phil. 1:1; 1 Tim. 3; Tit. 1—the question of the relationship between bishops and elders need not be discussed here). In Thessalonica “presidents” are mentioned (1 Thess. 5:12). Evidently, Apostles and congregations are free to constitute their church organization as it seems most expedient to them at the time. There is in the New Testament as yet no recognizable trace of a formal organization of the church at large.

2. The decisive element which all outward organization is to serve is also in the New Testament the preaching of the Gospel. That *must* be done and dare not be hindered by other obligations, even though they are otherwise legitimate (Acts 6:2). The Apostles are witnesses, preachers of the Gospel of the resurrection (Acts 1:22; 2:32). The self-testimony of Paul (1 Tim. 2:7; 2 Tim. 1:11; Tit. 1:3) and his directions to Timothy and Titus substantiate that the main obligation is teaching (1 Tim. 4:6, 11, 13, 16; 2 Tim. 1:8, 13; 4:2-5; Tit. 2:1, 3, 8) and the appointment of teachers (2 Tim. 2:2). The most important activity of church officials is teaching (1 Tim. 5:17; 2 Tim. 2:24; Tit. 1:9). Other occasionally mentioned offices (Eph. 4:11; 1 Cor. 12:28—if they really enumerate distinct offices) are only different aspects of the office of Gospel preaching, just as also the spiritual gifts enumerated in 1 Cor. 12:7 f. The “shepherds”—pastors—e.g., feed the congregation through the Word (Acts 20:28-30; 1 Pet. 5:1-3); likewise the “presidents” (1 Thess. 5:12); and the gifts of miracle working (1 Cor. 12:9-10, 28) is a testimony in deed for the Gospel (1 Cor. 2:4 f.; 14:22; Rom. 15:19; 1 Thess. 1:5). When offices are instituted which do not directly pertain to teaching, this is done to set free the members of the teaching office for their real ministry (Acts 6:2).

3. Thus we deduce also from the New Testament that church organization serves the purpose of safeguarding the proclamation of the Gospel; that on the other hand such order is in no way set up for its own sake; that furthermore such order is necessary (1 Cor. 14:33, 40), but no particular order has been prescribed by God.

4. Binding regulations for the outward organization of the church can therefore be drawn from the New Testament as little as from the Lutheran confession. The theses developed in section A, I, from the confession are in full agreement with the norm of the New Testament.

B

Is it possible to bring together different denominations into the framework of a common church order, or must each denomination formulate its own church order independently of the other?

1. The question is not simple in meaning:

a. “Into the framework of a common church order” can mean

- aa. that a complete church fellowship (pulpit and altar fellowship) exists.
 - bb. that two independent confessional churches are joined in a certain "administrative" fellowship, or
 - cc. that one denomination accepts the outward organizational form of another without entering upon a closer connection with it.
- b. The denominations in question have also not been named, even though the method of proof will in each case differ. We take it for granted that only the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches are here meant.
2. (To 1aa): The Lutheran Church cannot share a common church order in the sense of complete church fellowship (union in any sense) with a church that interprets Scripture differently and therefore has a different confession, because its church government must be determined by its confession.
3. (To 1bb): A certain outward "administrative" fellowship between a Lutheran and a Reformed church is possible; however, with definite limitations:
- a. The administration is to be separated with respect to those affairs which directly touch the confession: confession and doctrine; the cure of souls; worship and education; church discipline; the education, examination, ordination, appointment, retirement, spiritual administration, private study, and conduct of the clergy.
 - b. With respect to financial and other outward affairs a common administration may be instituted. However, since even the most remotely outward affair can under certain circumstances touch the confession and thus be placed in *statu confessionis*, provision must be made for such cases, either by a division of the administration touching this matter (*itio in partes*) or by the right of veto given to each side.
4. (To 1cc): This question has already been answered in section A, II. The Lutheran Church can under certain circumstances take on the Reformed presbyterial-synodical form of organization, but the Reformed Church cannot take over all forms developed in the Lutheran Church (e.g., the episcopal system). But even when both churches temporarily share the same form of organization, they will reveal a different attitude toward it.

C

I. How much has the outward organization of the Lutheran, Reformed, and "Evangelical" church system in Germany been affected by the political conditions from the 16th century onward and particularly also in the 19th century?

- 1. Since church government is a legal establishment in the sphere of civil righteousness (*iustitia civilis*), it was almost to be expected (and it certainly began very early) that it would be in-

fluenced by the legal establishment of its surroundings, particularly of the state, either by taking a somewhat similar form, or else by a conscious attempt to be different.

2. There was developed in the Lutheran Church the governmentally sponsored system of church government (the beginnings of which date back to pre-Reformation times). Quite naturally, the governmental order very strongly affected the Church, whose order took on a semigovernmental character. Theories were later tailored to fit the actual cases.

3. Even the Reformed provincial churches in Germany which had been led from Lutheranism to Calvinism by their prince continued with the State Church form of church government. This was somewhat in contrast to the Reformed confession, even though partly in keeping with Zwingli's ideas. Only the Reformed churches "under the cross," i.e., in territories of Lutheran or Catholic princes, formulated and adopted a genuine Calvinistic presbyterial-synodical form of church government.

4. In the 19th century the transformation of German territories into independent states which more and more adopted a constitutional form of government, necessitated a change also in the ecclesiastical order. At first the princes retained their sovereignty in the church government, which was merely expanded by the addition of congregational organizations and synods. This particular form of reconstruction was influenced on the one hand by the example of the political (parliamentary) structure, on the other hand by the Reformed pattern, and for the rest by sound Lutheran considerations of expedience.

5. The origin of "United" (Evangelical) churches in the beginning of the 19th century, particularly in the Prussia of that day, was almost totally conditioned by political motives. The new united "Evangelical Church" that was projected was above all to be a unifying support of the monarchy and at the same time give Prussia the position of leadership in the envisioned German Evangelical Church. However, the example of Prussia was not followed in all German churches and hardly at all in foreign countries. On that account, quite contrary to the original intention, the claim was made that the Lutheran and the Reformed Church continue to exist within the union, in order to prevent their isolation. That completely confused the situation. Real "united" churches were formed in Baden, the Palatinate, and Nassau, as well as in parts of Hussia. Also these were politically motivated, and it is therefore significant that they are all different from one another.

6. The ever-recurring attempts to unite the German Lutheran churches failed. One reason was the narrow provincialism arising from the sovereignty of local princes over the church government. The other was a problem which defied solution, whether recognition should be granted in Old-Prussia to the (Breslau) "Lutheran Church of Old-Prussia" alone, or whether consideration ought also

be given to a putative Lutheran Church within the Old-Prussian Union.

7. When after 1918 the secular episcopacy of the princes disappeared, the German churches were for the first time in a position to create their own constitutions. Oftentimes, however, political conditions exerted an influence in so far as the constitutional church organizations were, in part at least, bound to certain electoral procedures. The new organization was, a., a first attempt and, b., in part, strongly under the influence of the political example, either imitating or consciously excluding that pattern.

8. The Lutheran churches proceeded from the given circumstances in a truly Lutheran manner (retaining the consistorial-synodical organization) and supplemented that with such measures as seemed expedient at the time, particularly the episcopacy.

9. The idea of a *Corpus Lutheranorum* made slow progress. In 1927 the German Lutheran Bishops' Conference was born and in 1929 the Low-German Lutheran Confederation.

10. The lasting importance of the church conflict⁴ since 1933 for the question of ecclesiastical order consists in the renewal of the effort on the part of the confessional Lutheran Church, fighting shoulder to shoulder with the Reformed Church, to achieve a church government that would be bound to the confession.

11. This unanimity, however, was painfully ruptured by the disagreement regarding the application to the Old-Prussian Union of the principle that a church government should be bound to a confession. The question at issue on which no agreement could be reached can be formulated in the words: Can and should Lutherans and Reformed live side by side within a single church organization as ecclesiastical and theological tendencies, or must each confession establish its own church government, bound to its confession and its own church order, and thus actually dissolve the union?

12. The confessional Lutheran churches banded together in 1936 in the Council of the German Evangelical Church, which entered into a working agreement with the Reformed Work Committee. This had been preceded by the founding of the short-lived Lutheran Branch of the German Evangelical Church (May 14, 1933) and the Agreement of the Lutheran bishops of Bavaria, Hannover, and Wuerttemberg (1935).

⁴ *Kirchenkampf*—refers to the resistance which the confessional churches of Germany offered to the attempts of the National Socialist regime to incorporate all "Evangelical" churches of Germany into one organization under the predominating influence of *Reichsbischof* Mueller and of the so-called "*Deutsche Christen*," who had accepted the Nazi ideology of "blood and race." It was a doctrinal controversy which affected the central doctrines of Protestantism, justification by faith and the person and work of Christ.

II. What demands for the organization of the Church today flow from the change of these conditions?

1. The following guiding principles are derived from the foregoing:

- a. According to A, I, par. 15, the *status quo* is to be the starting point;
- b. According to A, I, par. 5, the Church is free to change the *status quo* in accordance with the present obligations of the Church;
- c. Yet the limitations mentioned in A, I, par. 6, must be observed;
- d. Also a difficulty must be taken into consideration: The ecclesiastical lawgiver certainly has a great deal of freedom in formulating the organization of the Church, but he is by no means sovereign. He is bound by the divinely imposed obligation of the Church and can therefore not work without restriction. Furthermore, he must find a way of expressing this situation in the church constitution, even though it cannot be set down in so many words.

2. The historically developed Lutheran provincial churches and their present form of organization (episcopacy, consistorial administrative boards, synods, and congregational organizations), which by and large has met the test of time, ought to be retained and developed organically.

3. (To 1b): Some individual details will need improvement and development, as the amalgamation of too small churches into a Church of the most efficient size for administration (which may lie somewhere between one half to three million members); a different arrangement and combination of synods and congregational organizations (possibly partly by election, partly by appointment), etc.

4. (To 1c): Everything contrary to the confession must be removed, as the finance-sections which are independent of the confession, or the presidential system in Thuringia,⁵ etc.

5. It is recommended that "indications" pointing toward the situation described in par. 1d be included. "Indication" in its meaning here is a constitutional provision which describes a principle or limitation, without claiming, however, that the principle (limitation) is made legally effective by the provision or that the principle (limitation) demands the particular formulation found in the provision.

⁵ A search in the reference room of the New York Public Library fails to reveal the exact nature of the objection to the presidential office in the Thuringian church government. From the context one may hazard the guess that the president of the Thuringian Church is either appointed by an agency of the State or solely responsible to it.

6. A particularly desirable "indication" according to Lutheran attitudes would point to the supremacy of the confession over all forms of outward organization. That could be accomplished by the sentence "Doctrine is not a valid sphere of legislative powers" (cf. A, II, par. 3). It would be of doubtful legal value, but certainly significant as an "indication."

7. "Indications" pointing to the limitations which the Lutheran confession imposes on all ecclesiastical order (A, I, par. 7-8) are also urgently desired. Thus some provision in the disciplinary regulations ought to indicate that a pastor may also be required by his ordination vow to protect his congregation from possible heretical measures of the church government. Particularly this limitation cannot be exhaustively stated in a legal formula. Only an "indication" is possible, but it is certainly desirable.

8. Likewise, to counteract a renewed (parliamentary) overemphasis of the supposed "congregational principle," it would be desirable to have "indications" pointing to the independence of the minister from the congregational organizations in the exercise of his spiritual functions, etc.

9. But "indications" are also desirable to counteract a certain overemphasis on the rights of the ministry. Such "indications" are, e. g., the congregations' right to call their own minister, which is provided for in so many church orders of the Reformation century; the participation of laymen in the administration of congregations and the church (as deputy chairman of the congregational organization), etc.

10. Above all, the Lutheran provincial churches are to be united into the Lutheran Church of Germany. The church provinces of the Evangelical Church of the Old-Prussian Union ought to be free to join the Lutheran Church after the fission of their Reformed congregations. On the other hand, they may prefer to join a German "United" (unierte) Church, in case it is formed.

11. The Lutheran Church of Germany could enter into an "administrative fellowship" (cf. B, par. 3) with the German Reformed Church which is in process of formation and a possible German United Church. The following changes would have to be made in the present constitution of the German Evangelical Church (D. E. K.): The *Reichsbischof* and his cabinet would be replaced by the presiding bishop of the Lutheran Church, the moderator of the Reformed Synod, and the president of the "United" Church. Each of the three church leaders would have his own headquarters offices obligated to its confession. This headquarters would deal separately with all questions which immediately touch the confession. However, representation toward the outside could be centralized, and it might be possible to arrange for joint sessions of the three denominational sectors of the headquarters offices. Financial and similar business could be transacted by a common headquarters, but the personnel would

likewise be obligated to the confession of their individual church. When desired by either of the three church leaders, also here the administration must be separated into its component parts (*itio in partes*). It would be a simple matter to reconstruct the German Evangelical Church in this manner, so that also here the principle enunciated in A, I, par. 15, would be observed.

12. An agreement between the three churches would regulate the manner in which isolated members of the Reformed (and "United") Church living within Lutheran congregations could be served so that they might participate as guests in the life of the congregation without impairing the confessional character of the congregation.

13. In case there are in one locality Lutheran and Reformed (and "United") congregations, they could apply par. 11 judiciously to the raising of funds for church purposes and to representation toward the outside and thus become united in an administrative alliance.

Some Information on Developments in Germany

Article printed in *Muenchener Zeitung* (American-sponsored), by Friedrich Meinecke, anti-Hitler, removed from *Historische Zeitschrift* editorship; submitted by Prof. Hans Rothfels, visiting professor at Brown University.

This is the voice of one of the innumerable people who today have lost their homes and all their belongings and are without knowledge of the fate that has befallen those nearest and dearest to them. They may be dispersed all over the country, while we are living in the most wretched quarters, struggling for mere existence. Yet I am calling for self-examination, and I hope that this call may possibly give some consolation and new courage to my suffering fellow countrymen. I write in the paper sponsored by our masters of today. May I do so without being suspected of delivering ordered work? Most definitely it is my own impulse and conscience which drive me, a man of high age and without fear of men.

In the spring of 1933 I was the last who warned publicly against Hitler. This was two days before the Reichstag fire. Then terror descended upon us and henceforth condemned those to silence who had seen from the very start in Hitler's achievements, dazzling though they appeared at first sight, something satanic and antagonistic to the spirit of Christian and Western civilization. This silence has been often misunderstood abroad and interpreted as a mere lack of courage. But in fact we were overwhelmed by a system of terror, inescapable and exercised with an ingenuity that has no parallel in history. It was characterized by two main features: First, it could be defied only if you were ready to become a martyr, not only for yourself but also to sacrifice your whole family. Second, the broad popular effect depended on the close interaction of this paralyzing terror with a propaganda that in-

filtrated into the masses and worked deceptively upon spiritual and even ideal needs.

Neither terror alone nor propaganda alone would have had the full effect. But closely interlocked with one another, they deluded the masses. A magnificent window dressing offering fine articles, worth their price, attracted the customer who had no knowledge of the dark and sinister background. Thus there originated among us a perverted "idealism," poisoned down to the very roots, and yet one to which many an otherwise honest soul succumbed. In addition, there was the great mass of cold and cynical opportunists and the even greater mass of those, particularly of young people, who for the sake of merely living and existing felt it inevitable to adapt themselves to the party.

This proved disastrous for the fate of all of us. For in this way throughout the nation the forces were paralyzed which could have led to purification and salvation. It is humiliating enough that it took a lost war to break the spell of the party.

One may ask me why I speak of our own omissions and weaknesses only instead of pointing to what the victorious powers of Versailles did to us. My answer to this is that in the total balance sheet of the Third Reich this aspect of the problem also would need exact consideration. But today it seems to me urgent that we examine ourselves and do our own housecleaning. One fact at any rate has to be acknowledged: With the Munich agreement of 1936 the victorious powers gave Hitler once more an opportunity to show a statesmanlike moderation in the time to come, to consolidate quietly the "successes" of his daring seizures and to preserve the peace of the world. But his demon drove him to perdition. By breaking the Munich agreement and marching into Prague in the spring of 1939 he showed that he knew of no limits in his expansionist drive, that he could not be expected to keep any treaty. Further concession on the part of his opponents had become impossible.

To those who saw more clearly it was apparent from the very beginning of the Third Reich that the mentality of Hitler and his party was bound to lead to war. And at an early moment the dark foreboding dawned in our mind that such a war, provoked in the most unfortunate constellation of the world, would end in a disastrous defeat. Only one thing did we not anticipate—that the party would succeed in exploiting Germany for their own sake by bleeding her white in a tremendous effort of almost six years.

Since the fall of Stalingrad and Eisenhower's landing in Africa it was perfectly clear that we could only prolong but not win the war. A government with a sense of responsibility would then have been in a position to conclude the peace in order to prevent a further and fatal bleeding of Germany. But for a man like Hitler and his party there was no such possibility of reaching peace. Who could have any trust in his loyalty to treaties? Thus there arose the terrible situation that we could not help seeing our cities destroyed

and millions of combatant and non-combatant fellow countrymen sent to death merely in order to prolong the lifetime of a party which was doomed to perish anyway.

All now depends on our life turning to its innermost springs. How many of the younger generation, when alone with me, have confessed in all these years that they longed for such a turn, for sincerity, truth, and inner cleanliness. Yes, there is still a young generation in Germany upon which we can set our hopes. They will feel at home again in our churches, and not only for the purpose of listening there to Bach and Beethoven. They want to go back to all the shrines of our nobler past, to Kant and Goethe, to Duerer and Thoma. Manifold are the ways by which the divine and eternal can be brought back into our lives. And precisely the German mind has helped to pave these ways, in all their variety, for the occidental world. Let us try anew! Perhaps our mission for the Christian occident has not yet ended! *

Roman Catholic and Lutheran Welfare

In the *Lutheran* of October 31 Prof. E. Theodore Bachmann of Chicago Lutheran Seminary presents a comparison bearing the title which we have prefixed. His remarks will be read with interest.

"Amid many secular ways of living, there is a Christian way of life. There is also a Christian way of serving life's needs through works of charity to which Christians are obligated. On the anniversary of the Reformation, it may be fruitful to compare the welfare work done by Roman Catholics with that done by Lutherans.

"Such a comparison might be made quantitatively. America has more than 23,000,000 Catholics, and more than 5,000,000 Lutherans. Both groups have a sense of obligation toward their own people, assisting them on the frontiers of youth, old age, illness, poverty. In child care Catholics do proportionately half again as much as Lutherans, while in caring for the aged the extent of their respective services is about the same. But in hospital work Catholics do proportionately four times as much as Lutherans. The number of full-time workers in Catholic welfare far exceeds that among Lutherans. There are, for example, 133,000 Catholic sisters, two out of five of whom are in charitable work; while we Lutherans have less than 500 deaconesses in America.

"Another comparison may be made in patterns of service. By virtue of a European state-church heritage and a protracted immigrant status in America, both Lutherans and Catholics generally have favored institutional care. In this they differ from

* NOTE.—The above article is submitted not because it is satisfactory or adequate from the religious point of view, but because it contains valuable information on developments in Germany, inclusive of the religious sphere, since 1933.—EDITOR.

American Protestantism, which has come to favor non-sectarian private agencies coupled with public welfare programs and community responsibility. In contrast to Catholics, Lutherans are organized in smaller units; smaller parishes, smaller agencies and institutions, and a lower per capita support of church-related welfare services.

"Behind statistics and patterns of service lie two major organizational developments, the National Lutheran Council and the National Catholic Welfare Conference. Both organizations are proportionately influential in their respective constituencies. Both are products of the first World War. Both help to guide and co-ordinate their assumed social task, the Lutherans through their Division of Welfare of the National Council, and the Catholics through the Department of Social Action of the National Conference.

"In Catholic circles each bishop is responsible for the development of 'the same systematic organization for the work of charity that has been vital in making effective the sacramental and educational mission of the Church.' Such charity is the expression of Christian duty as catechetically formulated and taught in the seven corporal works of mercy (based on Matthew 25:35-36). Catholic welfare work in its present extent is the outcome of many spontaneously undertaken services. It is the expression of faith and works, mixed with the very human desire for reward. If it is successfully integrated into the diocesan organization, it becomes related to the national and eventually the worldwide pattern of hierarchical organization.

"Among Lutherans the responsibility for welfare work has been variously expressed. In the age of the Reformation such welfare work as Lutherans supported was generally community-conscious; a fact which is still evident in German and Scandinavian Lutheranism. But in America Lutherans have been a long time in finding their proper place in the community, in relating their free enterprises in welfare work to the basic evangelical task of the church, and in finding a satisfactory relationship with other Lutheran private and public agencies.

"General church bodies, like the Norwegian or American Lutheran, may assume ownership and responsibility for the church's major hospitals, children's and other agencies, and thus administer an ecclesiastical welfare program through a central Board of Charities. At the other extreme is the Missouri Synod's decentralized free enterprise, which has resulted in the banding together of its agencies into the Associated Lutheran Charities. The Augustana Synod practices a conference-wide ownership and administration of its agencies. The United Lutheran Church has a medley of patterns, ranging from independent to synodically supported and controlled agencies. One of the tasks of the Division of Welfare of the National Lutheran Council is that of co-ordinating most of this complex array.

"In terms of resources, Lutherans believe they have a theo-

logical heritage superior to that of the Roman Catholics. Therein lies the Christo-centric message of the Reformation. But what Lutherans in general have lacked — at least in America — is a basic theory for relating their evangelical faith to effective action in society. Lutherans need a philosophy of welfare work. That means prayer and study.

"Lutherans have few places for training the wide variety of workers needed in the welfare field. They have no school of social work, while Catholics support nine, of which six are nationally accredited. Lutherans in America, in contrast with their brethren in Europe, have too often looked only upon the ministry as the one possibility for full-time Christian service. Can they reconcile their multiplicity of seminaries with their deficiency in other schools or programs of training for service? Nor should Lutherans think of guiding workers merely into church agencies. The mission of Lutheranism to the whole of society calls for enlightened and devout workers in many private and public agencies. How can we make this contribution effectively?

Because of the abiding challenge of Catholicism, Lutherans must realize that the Counter-Reformation is still a relentless movement. This is true in America today. It is even truer in Germany, caught in the throes of war's terrible aftermath. In this international situation Catholics are united by a consciousness of purpose which puts Lutherans to shame. A comparison of Catholic and Lutheran welfare work is ultimately a challenge of our devotion to Christ and of our readiness to bring the life-giving gospel to His needy members, not only in word but in deed." A.

Negro Education

Selective Service findings on educational standards reveal significant facts about opportunities afforded Negroes. Results of tests show conclusively that: 1) Illiteracy is much higher in the South than in other parts of the country; 2) Negroes, long disadvantaged in educational facilities and services, showed a much higher relative amount of illiteracy in sections where separate schools prevailed than in other sections. During the period from December 7, 1941, to December 5, 1942, it was found that 32 per cent of the 744,000 physically fit registrants without dependents, 18 to 38 years of age, who had less than five years of schooling, were Negroes. A report of the Director of Selective Service states:

"The high rate for educational deficiency remains one of the unsolved problems among Negro registrants. The four months' study made during the summer and early fall of 1941 indicated that the rejection rate among Negroes was five times that among white registrants. In the section of the country where the largest number of illiterates is found, educational systems for whites and Negroes are separate."

To appreciate these findings, it should be remembered that one out of every ten Americans is a Negro and that 77 per cent of our Negro population resides in the South. In eleven States south of the Mason-Dixon Line the average public-school expenditure per white pupil during the 1941-42 school year was \$68.04. The average per Negro pupil was \$26.59. A survey of non-State schools, were it made, would reveal similar inequality. The cultural, economic, and social development of Negroes—as well as their religious welfare—is hampered by such discrimination.

From *America* (R. C.)

Addendum

The following references are to be added to the article "Acts of Paul and Thecla" in the January issue of *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, pp. 55-62.

1. *Anglican Theological Review*, 1925-6, pp. 331-344: "Paul and Thecla," David F. Davies.
 2. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, 1886, Volume VIII, pp. 355, 487-492.
 3. *A Hellenistic Reader*, E. C. Colwell and J. R. Mantey, 1942, pp. 106-112.
 4. *In the Steps of Paul*, H. V. Morton, 1944.
 5. *The New Archaeological Discoveries*, C. M. Cobern, pp. 236 to 238.
 6. *The New Testament Apocryphal Writings*, J. Orr, 1923, pp. xxi-xxiii, 78-98.
 7. *Realencyklopaedie fuer protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, Volume I.
-

Theological Observer

The Potsdam Agreement Declared Inhumane.—With the purely political features of the Potsdam Agreement, drawn up several months ago by the United States, Great Britain, and Russia, this journal does not concern itself; it leaves them to the statesmen and the political leaders and the voting citizens. But there are some matters involved which belong to the moral and religious sphere, because the Agreement gives rise to the question whether an enemy nation which has been defeated may be treated with cruel brutality. President Truman sent a special investigator to Germany, Mr. Byron Price, to determine the actual state of affairs, and his report has now been made public. On the basis of his findings, the *Globe-Democrat*, a St. Louis daily newspaper which cannot be accused of manifesting pro-German tendencies, in an editorial of December 12, entitled "Our Botched Job in Germany," roundly denounces the Agreement as having led to intolerable miseries. "It is estimated that fourteen million repatriated Germans have been returned to the fatherland from the areas in the East conceded to Russia and Poland at Potsdam, which incidentally include 25 per cent of all arable land in Germany. Here was created a housing problem alone, not to mention food, fuel, and disease problems. The calorie level for the normal German consumer has been set at 1,550 per day, which cannot be met by German production. The Colmer Committee of the House, which recently toured Europe, reports that in many cities the official ration runs as low as 800 to 1,300 calories per person. The medically approved ration to prevent starvation is 2,000 calories, as was pointed out last week by Mr. Price."

Since from the Russian-occupied zone no food is taken into the other sections, the supplies needed have to come from America, says the *Globe-Democrat*. Germany is supposed to furnish more coal to the liberated areas, but the mines are producing only a fraction of their capacity, "largely because of disputes over French and Russian controls which resulted from the Potsdam Agreement." Even in the British-controlled portion of the Ruhr, where conditions are more favorable than elsewhere in the occupied areas, the coal output is only 30 per cent of normal. The editorial submits some information on German locomotives, stating that 70 per cent of them are in repair shops. It quotes General Eisenhower to the effect that German industry is functioning from 5 per cent to 7 per cent of its capacity.

Gradually people arrive at the opinion that the Potsdam Agreement was dictated by feelings of revenge rather than by motives worthy of civilized, not to say Christian, people. Perhaps our President was not aware of the dread consequences the Agreement would entail. As church people we must express our deep regret that the policy followed by our Government and its Allies in this instance offends against the principles of right and

wrong which are deeply imbedded in the human heart. We recognize that a country cannot be governed by the lofty standards uttered by Christ in the Sermon on the Mount, but the Government should at least not flout the dictates of morality which even a heathen, if he is loyal to the knowledge of the law given him by the Creator, cannot fail to recognize as commendable, proper, and just. And if through a mistaken policy our representatives have entered upon a course that violates these mandates of the eternal Law, they should correct the error as quickly as possible. A.

Efforts to Provide Relief in Europe.—The correspondent of the *Christian Century* writes from Geneva: "So serious is the situation in Central Europe that world bodies of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews have united in an appeal to save the children of the continent. The World Council of Churches, The World Jewish Congress, and Caritas Catholica Internationalis jointly declare that 'Children by the millions are in imminent danger of starving and freezing' unless help comes. They pledge themselves to 'work together in meeting the needs without regard to nationality, race, or creed.' The International Committee of the Red Cross and the Save the Children International Union also signed this appeal. The organizations joined in sponsoring a press conference at Berne to launch the statement with a heavy factual documentation showing that infant mortality rates in some places already are 100 per cent. The thought behind the appeal was not that a common relief organization should emerge, but that the constituents of each agency should be stirred to greater effort. The appearance of the plea in the Swiss press produced immediate inquiries as to where money and goods could be sent. Almost simultaneously, the World Council went even farther in an appeal for churches to secure 'large quantities of food, clothing, bedding, vitamins, medicines, and other essentials' for general distribution. The signers, including W. A. Visser 't Hooft, general secretary of the Council, Samuel McCrea Cavert, general secretary of the Federal Council, and all the other American secretaries said, 'What we have seen with our own eyes or heard from unimpeachable witnesses convinces us that the need in many parts of Europe is much more desperate than has yet been realized.' They declared, 'The churches must supplement the governmental program by special efforts of their own.' S. C. Michelfelder, American representative of the Lutheran World Convention, has been named acting director of the new Material Aid Division of the World Council. He asks that giving nations set up strong denominational committees, to work with an interchurch committee which will channel goods to the homeless and starving in the destitute countries. He calls on the American Christians to provide clothing, shoes, bedding, mules, cattle, cereals, and funds." A.

Two Reviews of Dr. M. Reu's *Luther and the Scriptures*.—In *Christianity Today* (November, 1945) there appears a very favorable review of Dr. Reu's well-received book *Luther and the*

Scriptures. While brief, it is objective and to the point and manifestly delights in the successful repudiation of the charge that Luther held a loose view of the inspiration of Scripture. However, with a note of sadness it adds: "It is interesting to note that the March issue (1945) of the *Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, published by its trustees, contains a review of this book which implies, if it does not expressly assert, that it is an attempt to revive a view of Scripture which though it "may have served the cause of Protestant survival in the days of the Counter Reformation, can hardly do more than encourage obscurantism and party spirit in the churches today." This, the reviewer in *Christianity Today* remarks, is said "despite the fact that its author's conception of Scripture is essentially that of the Westminster Confession of Faith, to which they as well as the faculty of Princeton Seminary are committed by their subscription vows." The havoc which Barthianism, as represented by Dr. Emil Brunner, has wrought at Princeton Theological Seminary is apparent also from these Modernist remarks in the *Princeton Seminary Bulletin*.

J. T. M.

Canon versus Dean.—Under this heading Dr. H. Hamann, president of Concordia College, Unley, S. A., reports in the *Australasian Review* (Vol. XVI, Nos. 2 and 3; April-Sept., 1945) a fine defense of Luther made by the Rev. Canon T. C. Hammond, principal of Moore Theological College, Sydney, against the charges which some time ago Dean Inge preferred against Luther, in particular against the accusation that "the whole conception of Nazism emerged through the action of Martin Luther." The article is far too long for full quotation in this section of church news, but some of the citations from Canon Hammond's vindication of Luther are so good that they deserve a place here as a witness of the truth voiced by one who loves fair play. Here are a few: "In order to show the weakness of Dean Inge's position it is only necessary to remember Luther's famous saying at Worms, 'My conscience is bound to the Word of God.' Luther translated the Bible into German. Dean Inge is greatly indebted to him for the Prayer Book version of the Psalms which came from Latin into English through Miles Coverdale's efforts, but via the Lutheran German version. Any estimate of Luther's character that overlooks this emphasis on the supreme authority of God's Word is an entirely mistaken estimate. Luther made the Word of God supreme in the lives of princes and priests alike." This firm insistence upon God's Word as the sole standard of doctrine and life alone rules out Luther as the spiritual father of Nazi philosophy, which in its religious aspects is essentially pagan. Again, as Canon Hammond points out, Nazism with its emphasis of moral superiority of one race over another could never stem from Lutheranism since Lutheran doctrine so forcefully teaches the sinfulness of man by nature and the sinner's justification only through faith in Christ. Against the misrepresentation of Luther's attitude in the Peasants'

War Canon Hammond says: "Luther was himself a peasant and anyone who reads his Address to the Nobles of Germany cannot but perceive that he had an earnest desire to see their condition improved. But when they entered on a campaign of slaughter and pillage against his earnest entreaties his wrath burst out in fiery flame against them." Yet Luther did not concede to any ruler the power to override conscience: "He did not hold that any ruler was the author of religious experience. He held with a desperate tenacity that God had once for all revealed His will to man. When God spoke, we have no other course open to us in righteousness but to obey. . . ." Against those who would make Luther the originator of Nazism, the Canon says: "It is truer to say that the needs of Hitlerism in his absolute demands on men originated the same type of administration that served a former generation when Papal absolutism sought to crush the world"; and: "It is easy to erect a convenient theory that the 'Divine Right of Kings to govern wrong' lies at the base of Nazism and that Hitler only borrowed from such a distinguished Anglican as Laud, who supported the Court of Star Chamber." Finally Dr. Hamann quotes Canon Hammond as saying: "A man who elects to follow the Bible may make many mistakes, but he can never be a Nazi." To this Professor Hamann remarks: "That is certainly true, if by Nazi we understand one who accepts the entire Nazi philosophy or ideology, as elaborated by the leaders and prophets of that movement." These few quotations from a rather lengthy and complete report may suffice to show that Canon Hammond's defense of Luther was on the whole well executed. The connecting sentences are taken from Dr. Hamann's more detailed account but shortened to fit in with our abridged presentation. Dr. Hamann quotes a number of remarks of Canon Hammond to which (as he says) he cannot subscribe, and he points out at the same time the distinct cleavage between Lutheran theology and Reformed theology in regard to civil government, which is brought to light also in some of Canon Hammond's declarations. Nevertheless one must agree with President Hamann's general verdict that the reverend Canon has "earned the gratitude of Australian [and may we add: all] Lutherans by refuting in a broadcast address the noisome assertion of Dean Inge that 'the whole conception of Nazism emerged through the action of Martin Luther.'" J. T. M.

Re-enters Modernism. — Modernism in recent years appeared somewhat as an angel of light, the expressions of liberals showing a tendency toward orthodoxy. But now has appeared a small but significant book, *The Christian Answer*, edited by Dr. H. P. Van Dusen, in which Modernism, in its former, entirely negative aspect, reappears. The book pretends to be the "Christian answer" to the spiritual, moral, and social needs of the world today. It contains five chapters entitled successively "The World Situation," "Christianity and its Secular Alternatives," "Central Christian Affirmation," "Christianity and Society," and "Christianity and the

Christian," which are written respectively by Professors Tillich (Union), Greene (Princeton U.), Thomas (Princeton U.), Aubrey (Crozier), and Knox (Union). But the articles were submitted to a group of liberal theologians who examined and re-examined them and whose corporate thinking (though there may be differences with regard to details) finds expression in this book. Among these are (to name only a few): J. C. Bennett, Georgia Harkness, W. M. Horton, John A. Mackay, Reinhold Niebuhr, H. R. Niebuhr, Wilhelm Pauck, and others. In *Christianity Today* (November, 1945) Samuel G. Craig, known for his moderation in passing judgment upon liberalism, submits the contents of the book to a searching analysis, supporting his final verdict with numerous quotations. There is in the book much that is helpful to the student of modern religious and social conditions, in particular, the graphic description of present-day religious confusion and spiritual perplexity. The writers agree that Christian theology needs must enter into the picture to save the modern world from utter ruin, but that theology is not to be Christian orthodoxy (wrongly called Fundamentalism). Perhaps the most important chapter in the book is the one entitled "Central Christian Affirmations," in which the theology which the world today is said to require is re-stated. But that theology does not recognize the supernatural in the form of the miraculous. Dr. Greene identifies the "supernatural" merely with "belief in God and the human soul." The book therefore endeavors to provide us with a nonmiraculous Christianity, as did ancient Modernism. Again, the "Central Christian Affirmation" rejects the deity of Christ, though it speaks of the Redeemer in lofty, though subtle terms, e. g., as "the redemptive power of God incarnate in a perfect man." It says expressly: "The exaltation of Christ by the early Christian was not meant as a speculative dogma about a second God but as a solemn and grateful affirmation that the one and only 'God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself.'" The statement from 2 Cor. 5:19 is of course understood in the sense of Ritschl and Harnack, i. e., in the sense that Christ was a mere man in whom God, in a special way, revealed Himself. This is proved by the fact that while the personal pronouns when referring to God are always capitalized, they are never capitalized when referring to Christ. Denying the deity of Christ, the book, moreover, teaches a purely modal Trinity, or Sabellianism: "There are not three centers of consciousness in God, but there is one Personal Being who exists and manifests Himself in three eternal aspects or functions." With the deity of Christ and the Holy Trinity there is repudiated in the same breath the vicarious atonement. Christ's sufferings are spoken of as vicarious, but we are told that they have "an analogy in countless lives of sacrificial love which had redemptive power over others." In reality there is no need of a substitutionary atonement, for "God is willing to forgive the sinner if he will only repent." This really is a repetition of what Harnack taught long

ago when he said that Christ does not belong into the Gospel, but that it is sufficient for the sinner merely to think of God as being gracious and forgiving. *The Christian Answer* of course has no use of an infallible Scripture as the sole source and rule of the Christian faith and life. Biblical revelation is not different in kind from "general" revelation. While God has revealed Himself in "the individual and corporate experiences recorded in the Bible, culminating in man's encounter with the historical Jesus and continuing in the recorded testimony of the Christian Church," God is continually guiding the Church into new truth. But let this suffice. The book is certainly not a Christian answer in any way to the religious needs of today. What the world needs today (as always) is the proclamation of the Law and Gospel, and no ersatz is able to rescue it out of its moral and spiritual perdition.

J. T. M.

A New Laymen's Inquiry.—Writing in the *Sunday School Times* (Nov. 17, 1945), Ernest Gordon offers the following very interesting remarks: "Mr. Rockefeller's Laymen's Inquiry on foreign missions made a great stir in the press of the time, but otherwise was unimportant. A committee was formed in Chicago to urge upon the churches the conclusions of the Report. '*Re-Thinking Missions* is potential leaven,' it explained. 'To do effective work, it must be embedded in the local churches.' A national committee with a long list of well-known names was formed. Commissioners were appointed to visit the major cities of the country, 'their expenses being provided for.' A résumé of the 'monumental report' was prepared for laymen by Mr. Stanley High. The Modern Mission Movement, designed to continue the Laymen's Inquiry, applied to sixty-seven mission boards for co-operation. Only five consented to experiment with it, to three of which Mr. Rockefeller had been a contributor. A year passed; nothing happened. The project was treated by the Christian public with complete indifference. *World Christianity*, its organ, suspended publication for lack of financial support! The more probable explanation is that nobody cared to read it. An interesting sequel has at this late day appeared. Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen, president of Union Theological Seminary, has gathered from all points of the war compass the observations of soldiers and laymen on missions as they have come across them. This has now been published by Scribners under the title '*They Found the Church There.*' In the concluding chapter Dr. Van Dusen makes this statement: 'Just fifteen years ago a small group of wealthy American philanthropists devised and financed an elaborate Laymen's Inquiry into certain areas of missionary work in India, China, and Japan. Their Report, *Re-Thinking Missions*, conveyed the impression that there were a few, probably a very few, individual instances of Christian work abroad which merited continuance, but that missions by and large were of dubious value. Today another Laymen's Inquiry is in process. It embraces the whole world. It is fortuitous, not carefully or-

ganized. It is being conducted not by college professors and scholars, but by hard-bitten soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines of the nation.' The book gives their conclusions and they are very different from those of the earlier survey." What Mr. Gordon's report shows is that Liberalism failed also here because it has nothing to give. Those who reject the Gospel of Christ have no bread of life for perishing souls.

J. T. M.

An Important Matter for "Co-operation in External."—Reporting on the Rhenish Mission in Southwest Africa, which in spite of the second World War was able to carry on its work, thanks to the permission granted by the South African Government, Dr. H. Hamann in the *Australasian Theological Review* (April-Sept., 1945) adds some remarks which are worth considering by all who cherish Christian missions. He writes: "All honor to the Government of the South African Union for its enlightened and humane treatment of these missionaries, and for the consideration thus shown to the cause of religion and to the heathen native population. If this policy has a parallel anywhere in the world, we have not heard of it. Yet absolutely nothing, no reason worth while examining, on any grounds whatsoever, can be urged in favor of the policy followed by the governments charged with the care of large native populations, both in 1914 and again in 1938—the obsession that the outbreak of war must be the signal for the internment, and perhaps later the repatriation, of all missionaries who happen to be of enemy nationality. The untold harm that such a policy works to native Christians in heathen lands is so obvious that nothing need be said on the point. That such a policy does not tend to increase confidence and affection toward their government on the part of these Christians, but rather has the effect of creating distrust, discontent, and disaffection among them and among others, should be equally obvious to thinking men. This effect has been observed by many missionaries, the present writer among them, when the Government of India followed a similar policy during the first World War. We have heard a great deal of late on 'co-operation in externals' among churches. The matter just mentioned is one where such co-operation is long overdue. Let there be united representation by all churches to all governments concerned that the internment of missionaries in case of war be not resorted to except for cause, *i. e.*, misconduct on the part of the one interned. Christian missionaries in heathen lands are in the highest sense of the term Christian and religious idealists. One cannot find anywhere men and women with a keener sense of honor, a higher sense of responsibility, over against the government under whose hospitality and by whose permission they carry on their noble work. There is something inexpressibly shameful and abhorrent in the thought that such missionaries, who are at the same time the friends and benefactors of native populations sadly in need of their ministration, should be treated as criminals or suspects or undesirables."

J. T. M.

Native Control of Church on Fiji Islands Attempted.— On the Fiji Islands the Methodist Church has conducted a successful mission. A new constitution has been drafted for the native church, which provides that the control is no longer to rest with white ministers, but with natives. The work heretofore was organized in three synods constituted along racial lines: European, Indian, Fijian. The two latter synods will remain, because each one of these two groups has its own problems. When questions that affect all will arise, then the whole Church will meet in what is called the United Synod. In this move one sees illustrated the tendency prevailing throughout the world that churches as well as nations strive to become independent of foreign control.

Why Do Not Fortunetellers Reveal Something Worth While?— The following remarks by Julius F. Seebach in the *Lutheran* are much to the point. "Fortunetellers are doing a land office business in the wrecked buildings of downtown Berlin. Their dupes are chiefly the wives and relatives of missing men. While they are carrying on their business of deception, they refrain from putting their alleged powers to work on a matter of extremely practical import all around them. Their revelations are given in the midst of the explosions of hitherto unexploded bombs or mines, which are constantly being set off by clearance workers, by people gathering firewood from the ruined buildings, and by children playing in the rubble. Here would be a grand chance for the fortunetellers to apply their alleged mystic powers in disclosing dangers." A.

Dr. Poling on Modernism.— In the *Christian Herald* of January, 1946, the editor, Dr. Daniel A. Poling, submits an article having the title "The New Evangelism," where a decided stand against Modernism is taken. Some of the paragraphs are so valuable that we reprint them here. After speaking of the decline in Sunday school attendance in many quarters, he says:

"It is affirmed that in this same decade Roman Catholic Sunday schools have *increased*, as have the schools of newer evangelical communions, such as the Church of the Nazarenes and the Assemblies of God. Also, there have been numerical gains among churches of conservative theology, notably the Southern Baptist churches, as well as in Southern Baptist student groups. The *Christian Herald* believes that in these and other gains made by the definitely evangelical communions there is a clear-cut significance. Christianity is an experience to be known even more than it is a lesson to be learned. Today too many 'Christian churches' and 'Christian colleges' neglect or starve the vines that bear the tender grapes. Within the year a young man now attending one of America's older Christian colleges, writing to a distinguished leader in the field of international relations, said, 'I want to go into manhood holding a faith like Dad's and yours, but I am bound to say everything here is against you.' In another letter to this same man, a father, describing experiences of his daughter, who is now a junior in one of our famous colleges for women, writes,

'She is getting a course in atheism.'" . . . Dr. Poling quotes a successful publisher in the secular field as saying, "I am inside the Church. My criticism is the criticism of a churchman. Where today is leadership that compares with that of John R. Mott, Robert E. Speer, Sherwood Eddy, E. T. Colton, Arthur Rugh, Fred B. Smith? — leaders when I was in college. They 'took' the cream of university life, top-flight athletes and students, first-rank personalities. They pledged men and women to Jesus Christ — that was exactly what they called it. I do not hear this in the American pulpit today. I do not find it in denominational or interdenominational religious gatherings. The Y. M. C. A. has no Fred B. Smith. Name me one youth leader of the churches who has, whatever his talents, the fervor and faith of Smith."

Dr. Poling continues, "Forty years ago this same Smith, who also captured me in my college days, spoke in Park Street Church, Boston. He was dealing then with some of the things that I am writing about now. He said, 'If you believe in a miracle-working God, then you have no trouble with the Person, the passion, and the saving power of Jesus Christ.' The speaker made it clear that to him God was law as well as love, but that the God he worshiped was something infinitely more than a test-tube demonstration. Recently, the *Sunday Visitor*, most widely circulated Roman Catholic weekly, wrote an article reminding America of the spiritual foundations of her most famous colleges and universities. Harvard was founded in 1636 to save churches from an illiterate ministry; William and Mary for the same purpose; Yale declared its aim was to prepare young men 'for public employment both in church and civil state'; Columbia was established with the chief objective to teach and engage children to know God in Jesus Christ.' Of 246 institutions of higher learning founded before 1860, only 17 were state universities. The academy, precursor of our high schools, which had its highest development by 1850, was definitely religious in character. The *Sunday Visitor* continues: 'Very few of these early colleges and universities have retained religion as an integral part of education,' and adds: 'An investigation made several years ago recalled that some colleges had reduced the number of students believing in God from one in five at entrance to one in twenty at graduation.'"

Dr. Poling next dwells on the sad truth pointed to by the *Sunday Visitor* that many Protestants reject the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. He continues: "And from quite another source the Protestant pulpit has been searchingly criticized — if not condemned — by educators and scholars who insist that during the war period, while a whole generation of youth fought and died for the cause of freedom, while they and their families were hungry for confirmation of their belief that theirs was a worthy cause, the pulpits generally preached no pride in this sacrifice, or frequently so preached as to make man ashamed. Dr. Lloyd W. Taylor, professor of physics at Oberlin, in stating this position,

wrote: 'The clergy seems to have lost its sense of proper timing. Let it resume its ancient role of comforter and champion of the oppressed. Only in this way can the gap between the pulpit and pew be closed.' What are we Protestants going to do about these criticisms? Unfortunately, what a good many Protestants are doing does not help very much. In a summer course conducted by a New York theological seminary in the summer of 1945, attended by more than one hundred clergymen from various parts of the country, one lecturer said, 'The only way we can see Jesus is through reporters who wrote the four Gospels.' . . . 'Did Jesus make a mistake? . . . We cannot believe that Jesus was misquoted. We must interpret the promises of the second coming on the basis that Jesus had the *limitations* of his century.' Speaking of the sacrifice of Christ, this professor said: 'The death of Christ was not a sacrifice. The sacrifice of Jesus was his entire life, of which his death was the climax. He made a sacrifice of himself through moral self-giving.' The brilliant and dynamic president of an old and distinguished theological seminary, in the course of his lectures, as recorded in the notes of one member of that class, had these things to say: 'Mary must have been a woman who had hallucinations. — The sermon on the mount was pretty good, as sermons go. — I do not believe in the historicity of the resurrection. The resurrection was an idea born in the minds of the disciples that Jesus' way of life could not be destroyed. — Jesus had to be saved. He saved himself by overcoming his ego and living unselfishly. — Even God has to be saved. God became good by denying Himself and by taking up His cross. He became good, like everybody else, by self-denial.' With regard to John the Baptist, the seminary president offered this: 'John was the neurotic cousin of Jesus.' And this about salvation: 'Salvation is the fulfillment of the personality, or the enrichment of the ego.' And this on the flight into Egypt: 'It may have had a bad effect on the mental life of Jesus.'"

Dr. Poling comments thus: "We do believe in free speech; but also in certain long-established Protestant institutions of higher learning there seems to be a free and easy treason behind bulwarks of economic security. The lectures from which we have quoted are false, not only to the founders of the institutions in which these distinguished clergymen are professors, but they directly deny and contradict the faith in which these professors still teach. But even more important, we cannot imagine any soul being inspired to seek forgiveness of sin and salvation in Jesus Christ by these lectures or their kind."

Referring to the late Shailer Mathews of the University of Chicago as a Modernist, Dr. Poling says that he at least always spoke with reverence, while the Modernist quoted speaks "as an intellectual snob." Stating his belief that churches which adhered to the old Gospel outnumbered the apostate ones, Dr. Poling quotes the well-known Dean Charles R. Brown, who said quite correctly

that "There are two views of Christ's person — the lower and the higher. The first claims that Jesus was a great man, a matchless leader, but not to be ranked above purely human category. The higher view insists that in a sense unique Jesus was also the Son of God, the express image of God's person, very God. Dean Brown goes on to declare that he holds to the higher view and considers it essential in the Gospel."

Here is much food for thought. Some of the ideas expressed must be received with a grain of salt; but there is no denying that the views of Modernism marching hand in hand with the principles of secularism have laid hold of the American public, and especially the young people, to an amazing degree. The faithful pastor will not fail, when he prepares his sermons and lectures, to take the onrush of this wave of unbelief into account. A.

The Presbyterian on Church Unions.—A few months ago there appeared an editorial in the *Presbyterian*, which is an organ for conservative people in the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. (Northern Presbyterians), that calls for comment. We reprint it here.

"We believe the rank and file of church members wish for a union, or reunion, any way a uniting, of denominational groups as rapidly as may be, and with a full acceptance of essential Christian doctrine. The obvious places to begin this process are along the lines where the least differences already exist. Presbyterians and Reformed Churches are religious groups with almost identical formularies of doctrine and very similar habits of worship. The Church government used among them changes very little from group to group. For years now the joining of branches of our Presbyterian Church family has been going forward (is it forward?) at a snail's pace. Committees and commissions have labored through endless conferences and protracted committee work with much erudition and little animation. There is always something the matter when success seems likely to come from all the efforts. It is time for the laymen in the Churches to take a hand in it."

The idea of the writer seems to be that the way for church bodies to get together is simply to say that they wish to be united and then to draw up a statement which gives expression to this sentiment and to declare the matter settled. It may be that the differences between the various Presbyterian groups are not far-reaching, and we are not thinking of them now in particular. It is the principle which must be followed that we should like to stress. With our fathers we uphold the position that a mere uniting of church bodies without unity of doctrine not only has no value, but is contrary to the clear teaching of the Word of God, which tells us that if we wish to be disciples of our Lord Jesus, we must continue in His Word (John 8:31). Any church union which is based on the principle of expediency rather than on that of adherence to the truth and unity in faith is bound to do more harm than good. A.

Chiliasm in the *Watchman-Examiner*.—It is well known that the teaching of the Fundamentalists of today, generally speaking, is shot through with a great deal of chiliasm. Hence we were not surprised to find that an editorial in the *Watchman-Examiner* entitled "The Jewish Problem" contains a strong dose of this false teaching. It is not our intention here to present arguments against chiliasm. We merely reprint a section of the editorial in question so that our readers may see the manner in which millennial ideas are placed before the American public.

"For the Christian, the significance of the Jews returning to Palestine is a spiritual factor. The place of the Jews in God's economy was not brought to an end by the coming of Christ; it still waits to be accomplished. The Apostle Paul said: 'God hath not cast away His people which He foreknew' (Rom. 11:2). They remain God's elect people, in spite of themselves (Rom. 9:4). Though few understand this language, they are enemies of the Gospel for the Christian's sake (Rom. 11:28). 'Through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealousy' (Rom. 11:11). In the end, 'All Israel shall be saved' (Rom. 11:26), which means that Israel is to be saved nationally.

"Jewish sufferings of the past few years will in the end prove divine compulsions driving an apostate people out of their ghettos in order that they might ultimately arrive in the land which God originally gave to their fathers. While he is out of his own land and unconverted, the Jew is a stumblingblock to the Gentile. It is the purpose of God, and not any international act of the Jews themselves, which has made Israel—as the nation which has most definitely rejected Christ—a token to the other nations. If there is any significance to the language that 'judgment must begin at the house of God,' here is an illustration. Israel out of his land and unconverted, represents a nation which should have accepted the Lord Jesus Christ as the Messiah but which has rejected Him. Their resistance to His power and name, their exclusiveness, singles them out as a people which is trying with the most intense human effort to build up a community without God as revealed in Jesus Christ. So 'as the eagle stirreth up her nest,' Jehovah has stirred up the Jews' nest in the ghettos of Europe in order to start them on a new march toward the dawn of a new day. They are yet to look upon Him 'whom they have pierced.' They are yet to kiss the Son and greet Him as their Messiah." A.

A New Eyewitness Account of Christ's Death?—The press of our country has been giving some space to an archaeological find in the neighborhood of Jerusalem which by some students is regarded as having special importance. The matter has not been studied sufficiently as yet to enable one to speak with certainty on the merits of the discovery. In the meantime we reprint a letter which our brother President Norman A. Madson of the Norwegian Synod sent to the *Minneapolis Star-Journal* and which appeared in the October 8 issue of that paper.

"To the Editor: On the very front page of your paper of October 3 you carry a story (INS) entitled: 'Eyewitness Story of Christ's Death Found.' It is supposed to have been found in the foundations of a house outside of Jerusalem. The article also states that 'the chief archaeologist of the Hebrew university at Jerusalem' has described it as a 'most important discovery.'

"But it is the closing paragraph of the story which most of all interests us. It says: 'The oldest previously known account of the death of Christ was written more than a century later. Its authenticity has not been proved.'

"Why call in question the accounts of Christ's death found in the Bible? Two of the Gospel writers were disciples of the Savior at the time of His death, and both (Matthew and John) have given us reliable records of His crucifixion. These records were most certainly made less than a century later. And the apostle John, in the midst of his account of the crucifixion, says this: 'And he that saw it bare record, and his record is true; and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe' (John 19:35).

"The chief archaeologist of the Hebrew university at Jerusalem may call it a 'most important discovery,' but it will never supersede in importance the record found in the Book of books itself. Let the authenticity of God's Holy Word stand unquestioned."

A.

The Difference.—*The Calvin Forum* (November, 1945) treats the doctrine of predestination in a comprehensive article from the Calvinistic point of view. We appreciate the frankness and the scholarliness of the article and, above all, the very fact that the *Calvin Forum* is willing to discuss a doctrine at a time when the discussion of Christian doctrine is very unpopular in many theological areas. But in the article a fundamental difference between the Calvinistic and the Lutheran doctrine of predestination is brought to light, especially in the final paragraph, in which we read: "The Calvinist acknowledges that he is chosen in Christ, yet the mediatorial office of Christ is not the cause of his election, but the cause of that salvation that he is chosen to obtain, and he has the unquestionable evidence of his salvation in the fruits of election. Subjectively, in faith, repentance, and perseverance, and, objectively, in God's special revelation illuminated by faith. Or, as John Calvin has said: 'For there is not a more effectual means of building up faith than giving our open ears to the election of God, which the Holy Spirit seals upon our hearts while we hear, shewing us that it stands in the eternal and immutable goodwill of God towards us; and that, therefore, it cannot be moved or altered by any storms of the world, by any assaults of Satan, by any changes or by any fluctuations or weakness of the flesh. For our salvation is then sure to us, when we find the cause of it in the breast of God.'" There are, in the main, two points mentioned here in which Lutheranism differs from Calvinism with regard to the doctrine of predestination. Lutheranism teaches that Christ's

mediatorial office is not merely the cause of that salvation that the believer is chosen to obtain, but also the cause of his election, since time and again Scripture emphasizes the fact that we are elected in Christ. In the second place, while his present state of grace is also to the Lutheran an indication and proof of his eternal election (for God has elected His saints unto faith and the fruits of such faith), nevertheless, the believer relies for his eternal election first and last on the universal Gospel promises of God's grace in Christ Jesus, which are seriously meant for all men. In other words, the foundation of the believer's hope that he is one of the elect is the *gratia universalis* and the *gratia seria et efficax*, as set forth in the Gospel. Our salvation and election certainly cannot be sure to us when we find the cause of it "in the breast of God," for no man knows the secret counsels which are in God's breast. The writer, of course, stresses the fact that our election proceeds from God's eternal goodwill as found in His breast against Arminianism, which wants man to rely also on his worthiness or good works. What he means to set forth is the *sola gratia*. But unless the *sola gratia* is taught side by side with the *universalis gratia*, as this is done in Scripture, not a single sinner in the world can be sure of his election and salvation. The difference between Lutheranism and Calvinism on predestination is indeed far-reaching. The Lutheran rests the assurance of his election and salvation on the objectivity of the means of grace; the Calvinist, if he is consistent, on the subjectivity of his personal assurance wrought by the Holy Spirit without means in the human heart. J. T. M.

Baptists Turning Away More and More from Immersion.—In the *Watchman-Examiner* of November 22, 1945, the Rev. Paul Barker of Saco, Maine, makes a significant admission. He writes, after having dwelt on his conviction that Baptism should be performed by immersion: "In more recent times, a gradual departure from immersion has resulted in a new tradition. One large denomination has actually circulated moving pictures showing Jesus being baptized by John as the former stood knee-deep in the Jordan and with John pouring water upon him from a mollusk shell.

"A departure from tradition is not always fatal, but to teach men that the new way is actually the traditional way is definitely a dangerous untruth.

"In some states, as many as one third of the Baptist churches accept members who have not been immersed. At first, nearly all such churches begin harmlessly by accepting non-immersed members under the guise of associate membership. As time goes on, new accessions from non-immersing denominations are more boldly accepted into the regular membership. My own church has followed such an evolution. The transition has been slow, and few persons are aware of the total change which has been effected.

"In one association of an Eastern state, some pastors are not

averse to performing the rites of pouring and sprinkling at the altar of their own churches."

What must be our reaction? We are, of course, of the conviction that immersion is not prescribed in the New Testament as the mode of Baptism. If people come to realize that God has not given us any law or regulation on this point, we rejoice. On the other hand, we must say that it is a bad thing to have a creed on paper and to practice differently from it. Such a thing ultimately is bound to break down true religion. As long as a Baptist believes that immersion has been commanded by Christ, he should practice immersion. The remedy for the cleavage separating immersionists from those baptizing by sprinkling does not lie in dulling men's consciences as to teachings of the Scripture, but in a careful study of what the Word of God actually says. A.

Brief Items.—The attention of all brethren who use the Spanish language should be drawn to a Christmas program or Christmas liturgy for a children's service drawn up by our brother Pastor A. T. Kramer of Bahia Blanca, Argentina. Whoever can use material of this nature had better soon get in touch with the author so that he may be equipped for the next Advent and Christmas season. This *Programa para Festejar el Nacimiento de Jesus* has the old familiar form of questions and answers among which are interspersed our well-known Christmas hymns. The hymns were translated chiefly by Pastor Kramer and Professor Lehenbauer.—We once more should like to draw attention to the *El Luterano* published in Buenos Aires, whose editor likewise is Pastor A. T. Kramer. The management is in the hands of Prof. R. W. Rippe. The August number is particularly interesting because it deals with our seminary in Argentina and contains pictures of the present seminary buildings and of the new ones that are planned, and of the professors and students.

The Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church (Suomi Synod) at its recent annual convention voted to permit use of the English language on the floor of the convention. Till now Finnish was used exclusively. The membership of the Church is 23,000.

"Clergy of the Lutheran Church in Denmark have emerged from World War II with the conviction that the Church and its pastors must be interested in all political, social, and national questions," says the Rev. John M. Jensen, editor of the *Ansgar Lutheran*, who has just returned from an official visit to Denmark. Let us hope that the Danish pastors will not become what is known in this country as "political parsons."

Today, in spite of our war aims, there is little religious liberty in Italy and that little grows less every day. The present Italian Government, with the tacit approval of Allied military government diplomatic representations, is in every possible way obstructing Protestant work. Our State Department should know that this is contrary to the principles for which we fought.—*The Presbyterian* of November 22, 1945.

From Glasgow a correspondent of the *Christian Century* writes about an effort to provide for the real or imagined needs of young people for Sunday evenings. "A large restaurant in the busy center of the town, which is normally closed on Sundays, is to be thrown open from the top floor to the basement each Sunday evening. Good music will be provided and refreshments at usual prices. There will be community singing in the ball room and a short religious epilogue for all who care to attend." To understand this endeavor, one must remember that in Scotland Sunday observance is still of the Puritanic type.

Of the trend in German church circles, the request addressed by Bishop Wurm to Bishop Marahrens of Hannover that the latter resign is symptomatic. Bishop Wurm is head of the newly organized Evangelical Church Council (a unionistic body). Dr. Marahrens is accused of having abetted the Nazi regime.

"The third self-evident proposition is that the results achieved by the American educational system are poorer than ever. Our children, that is, are receiving a worse education than our grandfathers. It is true that a smaller proportion of our grandfathers had educational opportunities—only fifty per cent of mine did, whereas all our children expect as a matter of right to go to college if they feel like it. The very process by which education has been opened to the mass of the population, the process which is the great glory of American education and perhaps the greatest contribution of our country to democratic theory and practice, has resulted in obscuring the aims of education and the consequent degradation of educational standards. Education today can only be defined as what is done in educational institutions. And educational institutions will do whatever any considerable fraction of the population asks them—or pays them—to do. Consequences are too well known to require elaboration here. They may be summed up in the word 'trivialization.'" — From an address of Robert M. Hutchins, Chancellor of the University of Chicago.

According to an item in the *Christian Century* the representative of the new Evangelical Church in Germany, elected at Treysa in August, decided to join the World Council of Churches. Its desire is to have fraternal relationships with the other bodies composing the World Council. Thus a unionist start is made. The leaders of the Evangelical Church in Germany are said to have expressed their "great solidarity of guilt" with the German people. They stated, "Through us has endless suffering been brought to many peoples and countries." Among the people that signed the statement were Bishop Wurm and Pastor Niemoeller.

According to reports from Norway, Bishop Ivind Berggrav, who is the head of the Norwegian Church, is working on plans looking to a more complete separation of Church and State in Norway than obtains at present.

From Portland, Oreg., the report comes that in respect to granting divorces this city is second only to Reno. Approximately there are twenty-five per cent more divorces than marriages in Portland. These dreadful figures are in part explained by the fact that marriages are often contracted across the lines in Vancouver, Wash., where licenses can be more easily obtained, and the divorces then occur in Portland, where the couples live.

At the meeting of the executive committee of the Evangelical and Reformed Church a Mr. M. R. Ziegler, who had just returned from Germany, reported that he had seen "fifteen thousand orphaned children without clothing huddled in one building with no windows and the cold winds howling through."

Professor Henry Pitney Van Dusen recently was installed as head of Union Theological Seminary and Auburn Seminary, succeeding Henry Sloane Coffin, who has retired.

From Princeton, too, comes the admission that the elective system, which for a number of decades has been in vogue in American colleges, has not been successful. In the future, so it is stated, the objective is to be "a closer control over the selection of Freshman courses." Sanity seems to be returning.

America (Jesuit weekly) states that the Feast of the Immaculate Conception (of Mary) has been chosen as the patronal feast of the United States. Nothing is said about the authorities who did the choosing. One thing is certain: Millions of Protestants will refuse to have a feast of this kind saddled on them. The same issue of *America* says that St. Joseph seventy-five years ago was proclaimed by Pope Pius IX the patron of the universal Church and that soon after that proclamation the stock of the papacy began to rise. Make your own comments, brethren.

How impotent a Christian citizen not holding political office is when endeavoring to influence the course of world events is demonstrated strikingly by the case of Evangelist E. Stanley Jones, who in the summer and autumn of 1941, according to the December issue of *Asia and the Americas*, tried his best to avert war between the United States and Japan and, of course, finally failed. Cf. the *Christian Century* of December 19, 1945.

An appeal for Government permission to send church supplies and funds immediately to former enemy countries has been issued by the Federal Council of Churches, the Foreign Missions Conference, the Church Committee for Relief in Asia, the Commission for World Council Service, and the Church Committee on Overseas Relief and Reconstruction. The authorities of our own Church have appealed directly to the President for such permission. A.

If I had three hundred men who feared nothing but God, hated nothing but sin, and were determined to know nothing among men but Jesus Christ and Him crucified, I would set the world on fire. — John Wesley, quoted in the *Presbyterian*.